A. 33.

AN

Exact Narrative

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS

AT

TURNERS-HALL,

The 11th of the Month called *June*, 1696.

Together with the

DISPUTES and SPEECHES There,

BETWEEN

G. KEITH and other *QUAKERS*,

Differing from Him in

Some Religious Principles.

The Whole Published and Revised,

By *GEORGE KEITH.*

With an *APPENDIX* containing some New Passages to prove His Opponents guilty of Gross Errors and Self-Contradictions.

LONDON,

Printed for B. Aylmer at the *Three Pigeons* in *Cornhill*, and J. Dunton at the *Raven* in *Jewen-street*, 1696.

No. 1.

G. KEITH's
NARRATIVE
OF THE
PROCEEDINGS at TURNERS-HALL,
THE
Eleventh of the Month called *June*, 1696.

A NARRATIVE

OF THE

PROCEEDINGS at TURNER'S-HALL,

ON THE

Eleventh of the Month called June, 1696.

A. 33.

AN Exact Narrative OF THE PROCEEDINGS AT *TURNERS-HALL*,

The 11th of the Month called *June*, 1696.

Together with the

DISPUTES and SPEECHES There,

BETWEEN

G. KEITH and other *QUAKERS*,

Differing from Him in

Some Religious Principles.

The Whole Publiſhed and Reviſed,

By *GEORGE KEITH.*

With an *APPENDIX* containing ſome New Paſſages to prove His Opponents guilty of Groſs Errors and Self-Contradictions.

LONDON,

Printed for B. Aylmer at the *Three Pigeons* in *Cornhill*, and J. Dunton at the *Raven* in *Jewen-ſtreet*, 1696.

Will.m Cole
Coll: Regal: Cantab. A.M.

The PREFACE.

THE *Preface to the Friendly Readers, throughout these Three Nations, and elsewhere, professing the Christian Faith in Sincerity. To all you sincere Believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, and true lovers of him, and of that Holy Christian Religion, whereof he is the Author, throughout these three Nations, and other Countries, where the Christian Religion is Professed, I do humbly recommend this following Narrative to your serious Reading and Consideration, of what Station, Rank or Quality soever ye be, the subject matter treated on in the said Narrative being so great Fundamentals of the Christian Religion and Faith, that the denyal of them is a downright denyal of the Christian Religion and Faith it self: Seeing therefore the Subject is so great, and so essential to the Christian Faith, it worthily deserveth and calleth for the due and serious Consideration of all the sincere Professors of Christ, to whose hands this may happen to come. And since the report of our late differences about Religious Matters, one with another, remaining under one common Name and Designation of Quakers, is spread far and near, not only through these Three Nations, but other Places abroad, as is apparent by the late* GENERAL HISTORY *of the* QUAKERS, *Written by* Gerard Croese *a* Hollander, *writ Originally in* Latin, *and lately Published in* English *here at* London. *And that the Report of the late Meeting and Conference held at* Turners Hall *in* London, *the* 11*th of the Month called* June, *is much gone abroad through both City and Country, chiefly with respect to the subject matter there discoursed, and my undertaking against them of the opposite Party, to prove certain Persons of greatest Note among them, guilty of denying and opposing these great Fundamentals particularly specified in the following Narrative out of their Printed Books, it may be judged that both the love of Christian Verity, and the sense of Christian Duty, will oblige and induce you to read the said Narrative, if it fall into your hands, and others to enquire after it that the truth of the matter may be searched into, whether these whom I have undertaken, to prove guilty of denying and opposing these great Fundamental Truths, be really so or I be guilty in accusing them. I cannot suppose that any sincere Professor of the Christian Faith, to whose Ears the Report of this great Controversie hath come, will be a* Gallio *in the Case, so as to care for none of these things. If your outward Estates, Liberty and Property, lay at stake to be endangered, would ye not be awakened to provide the best Remedy to secure them, how much more I hope will all sincere Professors of the Christian Religion be concerned for that which is incomparably more valuable than all these outward things? Even the Redemption of your Souls, which is your true riches; according to that in* Prov. 13. 8. The Redemption of the Soul of a Man is his Riches. *It is reckoned the greatest Cheat and Imposture that can happen in a Nation to corrupt and adulterate the true Coyn, and falsifie it, so as to make Brass or Iron pass for true Silver; what shall then be judged of such, who seek to adulterate and falsifie the true Christian Religion as to put another thing in place of it, even plain Deism or Gentilism; to wit, a Profession of Religion towards God, and Light in Men, excluding Christ God Man and the Faith of him, as he dyed for us and rose again, and is sat down in the Kingdom of the Father, and as he is to come again to judge the Quick and the Dead in the true intire glorified Nature of Man, having the true Soul and Body of Man, the same he had on Earth. The denyal of these great Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion, with some others necessarily related to them, and joyned with them inseparably, I have undertaken to prove my Opponents guilty of; and not only I, but many Judicious Persons that were present at that Meeting at* Turners Hall, *the* 11*th of the Month called* June *of this instant* 1696,

of

of the ſeveral Profeſſions of Proteſtants in this great City, did judge that I have effectually done it. But if I have not done it, and cannot make it juſtly to appear that theſe particular Perſons are guilty of the things charged by me on them, I ſhall freely acknowledge that I deſerve great blame, and therefore I greatly deſire (if it were the Will of God) that I might have yet a more Publick Opportunity to be heard, *as concerning theſe things, were it to be called before the greateſt Perſons of Authority in the Nation, either to make good my Charges againſt them. and if they be found guilty the blame to lye on them; or if I be found guilty, that I may have the blame laid on me. But let them be found ever ſo guilty, as I am moſt ſure they are, (let them cover and cloak as much as ever they can) I would not in the leaſt have them perſecuted, or any Sufferings, either in Perſon or Eſtate, to come upon them. My deſign in this undertaking is, that they may be ſhamed out of their groſs Errors if poſſible; or if they continue ſhameleſs in them, yet that all others who are not as yet tainted with them, may be preſerved from them, and cautioned and warned againſt them; for this Gangrene of their vile and groſs Errour and Hereſie, that is a complex of the woſt ſort of Errors and Hereſies that ever infeſted the Chriſtian Profeſſion, hath to my certain knowledge overſpread many parts and many perſons in theſe Three Nations, as well as elſewhere. Though I charge them not either upon the generality, far leſs the univerſality of all them called* Quakers. *But if they really diſown theſe groſs and vile Errors, which I have proved them guilty of in this following Narrative, and be cordial in the belief and acknowledgment of the great Fundamental Truths oppoſite to thoſe Errors. then it will be that which the ſincere Profeſſors of Chriſtianity in theſe Three Nations will expect from them, and may juſtly require of them, as publickly to retract and renounce theſe Errors, as they have publickly aſſerted them in their Printed Books in the face of the Chriſtian World, otherwiſe no ſincere Chriſtians will believe them to be in good earneſt, but that they reſemble many old Heretieks, and particularly the crafty* Arrians, *that pretended and made great Proteſtations that they owned the true Faith, according to all contained in the Scriptures, when they did nothing leſs. And whereas ſome have Objected to me, that ſince I have acknowledged divers paſſages in my own Books need correction, and have promiſed to do it, I ought to have done that in the firſt place, before I had charged Errors upon others, otherwiſe it would look like the Hypocrites ſeeking to pull out the Mote out of his Neighbours Eye, when the Beam is in his own Eye. I Anſwer, The things that* need Correction *in my Books, compared with the vile Errors in theirs, are but as my Motes to their Beams, which I had ſo far already pulled out of my own Eye, that I have freely acknowledged them to many* viva voce, *and have them in readineſs to Publiſh in Print with the firſt conveniency. Nor are they ſuch things as oppoſe any Chriſtian Principles of Faith, but of an inferiour nature. And it muſt be one of theſe two things that are their greateſt hinderances to publiſh any ſuch Corrections; that is, either that they are ſtill entangled in theſe Errors, but are not willing it be known, fearing leſt the preſent publick avouching of them may bring ſome Perſecution on them, or great Infamy and Reproach; or if they be in their Conſciences convinced of thoſe Errors, and ſo are come to a better underſtanding of Chriſtian Doctrines and Principles, yet their Pride and high Authority that they have gained over their too credulous followers will not ſuffer them to make any ſuch free acknowledgment, but eſpecially becauſe any ſuch free acknowledgment, by their own argument and way of reaſoning againſt all other Miniſters in all Chriſtian Profeſſions, would as much unminiſter them, as others they have unminiſtred on that account; viz. want of Infallibility, or being ſubject and lyable to Errors and Miſtakes in Articles of Chriſtian Faith. And this will alſo not a little ſtick in the way, to be ſo humbled that they muſt acknowledge* G. Keith *has not falſly accuſed them, (as they have ſeverely charged him to have done) if they confeſs their former Errors: But how much better were a ſincere Confeſſion in the*

caſe,

caſe, taking ſhame as due to them, and humbling themſelves under the power and victory of Truth, than a haughty and arrogant ſtanding out to juſtifie themſelves in theſe things that neither God nor good Men will ever juſtifie them in. And if they continue ſo bold, as to hold ſuch palpable Contradictions as are diſcovered in their former and latter Books, and ſometimes in the ſame Books, all ingenuous Perſons that know their Contradictions, will conclude them not only ſtill guilty of thoſe Errors, but great Hypocrites; for none but ſtark mad men, and craſed in their Underſtandings (as they have falſly and injuriouſly repreſented me to be) will hold perfect Contradictions, as ſuch. but Hypocrites may ſo diſſemble and juggle with them that are weak ſo as to make them think theſe things, that are real Contradictions, are not ſo indeed, but well conſiſtent Truths. It nothing (I thank God) moves me that they ſo ſeverely accuſe me, as they have done in their late Printed Pamphlets and Papers; that Envy and Malice hath influenced me thus to expoſe them, the teſtimony of my Conſcience, and which is more, of that holy witneſs in my Conſcience, clearing me of all ſuch imputation, is as a Braſen Wall to me againſt their evil and injurious Aſperſions: As they cannot prove it to be ſo by any of my words or deeds, ſo the comfort I have in that inward Peace of Conſcience in that diſcharge of my Duty both to them, and to all in the Three Nations, to whom this my ſo publick Appearance, I hope will be of ſervice, is ſafeguard enough unto me againſt their uncharitable conſtructions. And I do freely leave it to all Impartial Judges, whether they or I be guilty of this ſevere Charge; and let the Tree be judged by the Fruits.

Their pretended Excuſes for not meeting me, as deſired, at the Place and Time mentioned in my Printed Advertiſement, are ſo frivolous and weak that they are ſcarce worth noticing: But however the chiefeſt of them I Anſwered on the Place, as the following Narrative will certifie. Their pretence of their not meeting me, for the ſake of Religion, the Liberty granted us, and the Civil Peace, is an empty ſhift, and poor evaſion. *Is it contrary to their Religion to diſpute their Adverſary,* viva voce? *Why then did they diſpute with the* Baptists, *and mightily provoked them thereunto, and that* viva voce? *And not only with them but with many others, both at* London, *and in many other Places in the Nation, and that before promiſcuous and mixt Auditories, as they commonly call the World, (excepting their own Party, whom they call,* The Elect People of God). *And why did* W. Penn *give ſuch a daring Challenge to* Thomas Hicks, Reaſon againſt Raiſing, *p.* 184. *and complain againſt him in theſe words?* I muſt needs tell the World, the baſe Cowardice of this Adverſary in hand; for we have offered him a free Meeting, with his Books in our hands proffering to refute them, *viva voce,* before the World; but inſtead thereof, or any other way, (as ſeveral have been tendered) he diſingenuouſly ſlinks away, and puts us off by meer Shifts and Evaſions. *And let the Reader judge if* W. Penn *has not ſhown great Cowardice and his Party charged by not appearing at all; whereas* T. Hicks, *at leaſt, once appeared. But why ſhould ſuch a Diſpute* viva voce *be conſtrued to be againſt the* Liberty *granted us, and the* Civil Peace, *more now than then; when at that time thoſe in Civil Authority were more ſevere, whereas now they are very propitious? And why ſhould Diſputes* viva voce *be more offenſive to Civil Peace than Diſputes in Print? I believe they can give no Reaſon. And it is altogether incredible, that my undertaking the Vindication of the Fundamental Principles of the Chriſtian Faith, profeſſed by the preſent Authority, againſt ſuch manifeſt Oppoſers of it as I have proved my Opponents to be, can be conſtrued by the Authority to be any breach of the Civil Peace, eſpecially when I had procured the Leave of the Lord Mayor of* London *for ſuch an undertaking, whereof my Opponents were not ignorant. Their upbraiding me with vain ſpeculations, not telling what thoſe are, ſhoweth their great impertinency: But ſuch who are but a little acquainted with the Religious Differences betwixt them and me, may eaſily gueſs what they mean by my vain ſpeculations, even the Fundamental Truths*

of the Christian Faith, and other solid and sound Articles of Doctrine thereunto belonging: And if these be not they, I dare them to name what my vain Speculations are, whereof they accuse me. But to be sure, the plain and manifest Proofs I have brought out of their Books against the greatest Truths of Christianity, demonstrate their Speculations not only to be Vain, but Pernicious and Pestiferous. Their Hypocrisie is manifest, in making what they call my Passionate and Abusive Behaviour, an Excuse for not meeting me, when desired. For if they thought that I would show any such Behaviour, it would be such an advantage to them, that it would rather be an Argument to invite them to meet me, that I may discover my self, than to dissuade them. But blessed be God, that preserved me at that Meeting, when I had great Provocation given me by some of their Party, in such a Temper and Moderation of Spirit (as hundreds are ready to witness) as became a sober Christian, when some of them that appeared against me, shewed themselves very outragious. And as insignificant is their Excuse of declining to meet, because it was not an agreed Meeting on both sides: As if guilty Persons are not to be tryed without their consent and agreement. Was it not more Fair, Just and Equal in me, and my Friends, to give them a fair Tryal, with open and free access of all sober Persons, as many as the Place could contain without Croud, and leave it to the Consciences of the Auditors how to judge, and intimate my Intention at a convenient time beforehand, than for them to condemn me in a clandestine Place without all Tryal, fair or unfair, and not to let me have access to them, but when and how little time they pleased, and to suffer none of my Friends to be present to be Witnesses of their unfair proceedings against me. Their upbraiding me by insinuating my assuming a Spiritual Jurisdiction over them, and summoning them to appear before me, is idle and vain.

The Injurer is Debtor to the Injured, and accountable to him: But let them tell what Spiritual Jurisdiction they had over me, to call me several times to them at their Yearly Meetings 1694, *more than I had over them to call them to our Meeting at* Turners-Hall, 1696, *unless they will fly to their common Pretence, common to them with the Church of* Rome, *their* Infallibility; *the contrary of which they have manifestly showed; and never any Society of People professing Christianity hath given greater Instances of not only their Fallibility, but their being miserably deceived, than these Men have done. And as idle is that other Excuse of theirs, that they will not dispute with me,* viva voce, *because I am gone off from them (but they did thrust me from them by their Unjust Excommunication, when I would have stayed among them so long as I could have any hope to have reclaimed them from their Errors); but if my going off be a sufficient Reason why they will not Answer me* viva voce, *it is as sufficient a Reason why they should not Answer me in Print, which yet they boast they will do: For if I be not worthy nor fit to be Answered by Word, nor am I to be Answered by Writ: But all this sheweth their confusion and inconsistency. They think such a Meeting at* Turners-Hall, *is but in a corner, and not in the face of the Nation; but they are like to find it hath been so much in the face of the Nation, that many in the Nation will notice it, possibly more than they would either wish or expect; and more than any thing that hath happened to them for many Years past, to give the Nation a discovery of them and of their vile Errors and irregular Practices.*

If my Adversaries happen to put out an Answer to this Narrative, *filled (as their manner is) with Falsehoods and Perversions, and vain Shifts and Evasions, I purpose, with Leave of the Civil Authority, which I hope to obtain as well as formerly, God willing to Print* **a New Advertisement of a Meeting, and to give them timely Notice beforehand, to detect their Errors and Abuses yet further, and to renew the like Practice, as oft as they abuse the World and me with their Prints.** *For their unfair way of Disputing in Print, is much easier discovered* viva voce, *than by Answering in Print, and is more acceptable to all Free and Impartial People, who in that way are more capable to judge.*

G. KEITH.

It is thought proper in the first place to insert the following *Advertisement*, bearing date the 11th of the Third Moneth, called *May*, 1696, and sent to those Persons called *Quakers*, chiefly concerned; it being the occasion of the following Conference.

An ADVERTISEMENT.

Of a Meeting (*about some Controversies in Religious Matters of Faith*) *to be held by* George Keith *and his Friends, at their usual Meeting-place in* Turners-Hall *in* Philpot-Lane, London, *the Eleventh Day of the Month called* June, 1696. *to begin about the Ninth Hour, and to be adjourned, if Occasion requireth: To which Meeting* William Penn, Thomas Elwood, George Whitehead, John Pennington, *and these of the Second Days Weekly Meeting at* Lombard-street, London, *called* Quakers, *are justly desired to be present, to hear themselves charged, and proved guilty of the following things, and they shall be freely heard, to answer to their several Charges.*

First, WHereas *William Penn* hath accused me *George Keith*, in a Publick Meeting at *Ratcliffe*, of my being an *Apostate*, and Impostor, and endeavouring to pluck up the Testimony of Truth by the Roots; and that he hath not either then or since, after many months, proved his Charge to be true, tho' he promised to answer me (before many Witnesses) when I told him, I thought to put him to prove his Charge in the Face of the Nation: And I being conscious to my self, that I am not guilty of his Charge, I charge him to be guilty of False Accusation, and Defamation, and offer to prove him to be so; as also I offer to prove him guilty out of his Printed Books (which it doth not appear that he hath Retracted or Corrected) of most Erroneous and hurtful Principles, contrary to the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Faith and Religion delivered to us in the Holy Scriptures: And also that he is guilty of gross Contradiction to himself.

Secondly, Whereas *Thomas Elwood* hath Printed sundry Defamatory Books against me, I charge him to be guilty of False Accusations, Perversions, and Forgeries, contained in his said books, as also of most Erroneous and Hurtful Principles, to the great shame of his Profession, and Scandal of Christian Religion, and I offer to prove him to be so.

Thirdly, Whereas *George Whitehead* did joyn with a prevailing Party, in that called *The Yearly Meeting of the* Quakers, in the Third Month, 1695. to pass a most Unchristian Censure of Excommunication against me, (without any Proof or Charge of either

Error in Doctrine, or Evil Converſation) I charge him to be guilty of Falſe Accuſation, and of a moſt falſe and unjuſt Cenſure, and offer to prove it againſt him. As alſo, I offer to prove the ſaid *George Whitehead*, out of ſome of his Printed Books (which it doth not appear that he hath Retracted or Corrected) guilty of moſt Erroneous and Hurtful Principles, contrary to the Fundamental Doctrine of the Chriſtian Faith and Religion.

Fourthly, Whereas *John Pennington* hath Printed Defamatory Books againſt me, and hath Accuſed me to be an Apoſtate, I charge him to be guilty of falſe Accuſation and Defamation, and I offer to prove it at the ſaid Meeting.

Fifthly, Whereas the *Second Days Weekly Meeting* of the People called *Quakers*, in *Lombard-ſtreet*, *London*, hath approved or Countenanced the above-mentioned Scandalous Books, and another late Book from *Penſilvania*, ſigned by *Caleb Puſey*, falſly called by him, *A modeſt Account from* Penſilvania *of the Principal Differences in a Point of Doctrine, &c.* I charge them to be guilty of great Injuſtice againſt me, as alſo of being guilty of the falſe Accuſations, Perverſions, Forgeries, and falſe Doctrines contained in the ſaid Books by their approving the ſame, and allowing them to be publickly ſold next Door to their Meeting-place, by one of their own Profeſſion.

If it happen that few or none of the above-mentioned Perſons ſhall be preſent at the ſaid Meeting, being conſcious to themſelves of the badneſs of their Cauſe, yet I do hereby declare and publiſh my full intention to be preſent, (God willing) with my Friends, at the ſaid Place and Time appointed, to make good the Charges againſt them. And any moderate and Friendly People of other Profeſſions, have freedom to be preſent, ſo far as there is room in the place to receive them, without Crowd or Throng, to hear what ſhall be ſaid and proved in theſe matters above-mentioned.

London, the 11th day of the Third Month, called *May*, 1696. GEORGE KEITH.

And here I think fit to give a true Account of the Juſt Cauſe I have to intimate ſuch a Meeting.

IN my book called, *A Seaſonable Information and Caveat*, againſt a ſcandalous book of *Th. Elwood*, I made a profer to *Th. Elwood*, to meet him at any Place and Time that he would appoint, to prove him guilty of groſs Forgery in matters of Fact, *&c.* and alſo of falſe Doctrine: But he did no wiſe aſſent to any ſuch proffer, nor gave any rational Excuſe for his Rufuſal (pretending, *he would not give* G K. *an Opportunity to gratifie the Rabble, and diſgrace his Profeſſion he yet made of Truth, by ſo publick a diſcovery of his ungoverned Paſſions*). [What is this but great hypocriſie? And no doubt, if he or his Party thought to get any advantage againſt me, ſuch a Publick Appearance, either in regard of the Cauſe, or of what he and they call my *ungoverned Paſſions*, they would greedily embrace it: But the reality of the matter is, they are not willing their great injuſtice, as well as their inſolent carriage, and moſt unruly Paſſions in clandeſtine places, ſhould be diſcovered; ſhutting the doors upon all but themſelves, that none that were equal and impartial Hearers and Obſervers might be preſent, to be a check to their rude and inſolent carriage againſt me, many ſpeaking to me at once, which ſome among themſelves reproved at the firſt Yearly Meeting, I appeared among them. Thus they ſeek to murther the Reputation of the Innocent in ſecret places.] And inſtead of aſſenting to my juſt proffer, he prints another book againſt me, filled with more than double (to what was in his former book) of Forgeries, Perverſions, Falſe Accuſations and Miſrepreſentations. And I having neither time, nor ability of outward Eſtate, to print Anſwers to him and others, that heap book upon book againſt me, with no charge to them, (they having got a way without any charge or coſt to them, to Print what they pleaſe). And things being thus,

I appeal to all moderate perſons, whether this my intimation of ſuch a Meeting, in the defence of the Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity, as the neceſſity of Faith in Chriſt,

Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered at *Jeruſalem* to our Salvation, Juſtification and Sanctification, by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, the Reſurrection of the Body that dyeth, and Chriſts coming without us, in his Glorified Body, even the ſame that formerly ſuffered Death for our ſins, to Judge the Quick and the Dead: All which I offer to prove have been oppoſed and contradicted by ſome of them, being the common Faith generally and in common profeſſed by Chriſtians in all profeſſions, and for the defence of which, all ſincere Chriſtians are jointly concerned, and alſo in my juſt vindication, both as a man and a Chriſtian, be not juſtifiable and commendable, it being the beſt way I have at preſent to clear the Truth and my Innocency, and diſcover their great injuſtice towards me, and to Anſwer the proud and inſulting boaſtings of my Adverſaries.

And whereas in my late Book, called, *A ſhort Liſt of ſome of the vile and groſs Errors of* Geo. Whitehead, *&c.* I propoſed a juſt demand to *William Penn*, to give me an Opportunity for him to make good his Charge againſt me at any publick Meeting of the People called *Quakers*, in or about *London*; inſtead of his aſſenting to my juſt Demand, there comes forth a Third Book of *Tho. Elwood*, multiplying his groſs Forgeries, Defamations, and Miſrepreſentations againſt me, and alſo containing moſt falſe and Antichriſtian Doctrine, to the great diſhonour of the bleſſed Name of Chriſt, and the Chriſtian Religion. And as if *G. W.* and *W. P.* were not alive, or not able to Anſwer for themſelves, he will needs Anſwer for them; and the ſaid *Tho. Elwood* puts a moſt impudent and notorious perverſion upon my plain words, in my Propoſition to *W. Penn*, ſaying of me, as he has worded his Demand, he ſeems to have beſpoke a Publick Meeting that he might have done it himſelf; ſee *page* 159. and *page* 160. of his *Truth defended*. *As if* (ſaith he) *he wanted ſuch an Opportunity to prove himſelf an Apoſtate*. Let the Reader but read my words in my own Book, and at the firſt ſight he will ſee the Cheat and Forgery. Obſerve Reader my words, *p.* 32. *And let him ſignifie to me the time and place where he will make it to appear.* (I ſay not *when I will*) that his Charge againſt me is true.

May I not well ſay, that ever ſuch a groſs and impudent Forgerer, Wreſter and Perverter of a Mans words, ſhould be allowed or permitted to be an Agent, Patron, or Champion for what they call the Body of the People named *Quakers*, and their Miniſtry, is a ſign that they are at a low Ebb, when they make uſe of ſuch Tools as *T. E.* is, whom I can, and do offer to prove not only to be guilty of groſs Forgeries and Perverſions, and Antichriſtian Principles, but groſly ignorant (in that which he pretends to have knowledge) —of Humane Learning; and who is guilty of Pedantick trifling and quibbling, from meer Errors of the Preſs, not ſo duly corrected, yet obvious to any intelligent Reader.

And to my demanding the like Juſtice to be done me, as ſome Years ago we demanded of the *Baptiſts*, againſt *Thomas Hicks*, he anſwereth in his laſt book, falſly called, *Truth defended*, pag. 158. *That betwixt that and this of mine, there is no parallel: For* (ſaith he) *in that there was a people concerned on each ſide*, &c. *Whereas* W. P's *calling* G. K. *Apoſtate, affects no body that I know of* (ſaith *T. E.*) *but himſelf and himſelf, but juſtly: neither is* G. K. *of any People now, ſo far as I can underſtand.*

Now Reader conſider (and judge by this Taſte in the End of his Cask, what ſort of Liquor fills the whole), W. P's *calling* G. K. *Apoſtate, affects no body that he knows of but himſelf.* If this were true, as it is moſt falſe, is it not moſt unjuſt Reaſoning? *G. K.* is but one, and the charge of Apoſtate affects no body but himſelf; therefore he muſt not have Right done to him, nor muſt his complaint be heard of his being wronged. Hath not every ſingle perſon as real and true Right to Juſtice, as a great number? Otherwiſe he muſt Juſtify all the Perſecutions and Murthers that have been acted upon ſingle perſons, who have had none perhaps to own them but God alone. But *T. E.* knoweth that *G. K.* has Wife and Children that are affected with this unjuſt charge of *W. P.* tending to the expoſing of them to ruin and want. If ſo be either *W. P.* or *T. E.* could beget an univerſal perſwaſion in people, that his Charge is true, but that *T. E.* ſaith, the Charge affects me juſtly, is his begging the Queſtion, which neither he, nor any elſe can prove; for they cannot prove that I am declined in the leaſt, from any Principles or Practices of

Christianity that I formerly professed: But that without any change of Principles, from what I formerly professed, even since I was owned by the people called *Quakers*, I understand better some places of Scripture; and that God has been pleased of late Years further to enlighten me, and enable me more clearly to conceive, and more distinctly and safely to hold forth the same Principles of my Faith formerly received by me, is no sign of my Apostacy, but of my growth in the Truth, and in the knowledge of it.

And whereas there is one thing they mightily aggravate against me, and think they have catch'd me in a great Contradiction, that some time ago I had an Opinion of *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, and some others, as being men of sound Principles, and of late I have charged them to the contrary. But to this I Answer, This is no contradiction in Principle, or matter of Doctrine; the most it argueth, is, that I have been mistaken in these men: but I never heard that a mistake only in mens persons, was ever made a Badge or Character of Apostacy. But they have no advantage against me in respect of the change of my Opinion of these men, but I have the same advantage against them; for they have as much changed their Opinion of me as I have of them. And what change of Opinion I have had of them, is occasioned by themselves, in their late cloaking and excusing vile Errors, which at last, by a more diligent search into their books (than formerly I made) I found them guilty of. But whereas *T. E.* saith, *G. K. is of no people now*, so far as *he can understand*; I value not what he understands in the case; I was then, and now am a Member of Christs body, which is his Church, that is not limited to this or that particular Society; nor was I ever so strait in my Charity, to think none the people of God but them called *Quakers*. And notwithstanding their Bull of Excommunication against me, from a prevailing Party or Faction in the last Yearly Meeting, I have been since well owned, and my Testimony well received at a considerable number of Meetings within not many miles from *London*, and many of them owned to be Friends and members of the same body, whereof he professeth himself a member. And if it were necessary, I could easily bring a proof, that some, owned as his fellow-members, do own me more than they own him. And it is well known, that these Abuses I have met with from *T. E.* and *W. P.* and the prevailing Faction in the last Yearly *Meeting*, have affected many honest and Conscientious People called *Quakers*, in divers places, and have been a great scandal and offence to them.

However, to take away all pretence of Excuse from *T. E.* and stop his mouth in the Case, he may see where a *Meeting* of People have publickly owned me, and my Christian Testimony, in their printed Treatise, called, *A Seasonable Testimony*; (and these did own me then as now) and have disowned the unchristian and false Excommunication given forth against me by that called, *The Yearly Meeting*, 1695. that gave themselves no particular designation of people, nor mentioned any particular *Meeting-Place* where they met, only Signed by a Raw Young *Man*, that serveth for his Salary, and dared not but Sign what they enjoyned him, for fear of losing his hire.

G. K.

THE

THE

Proceedings at *TURNERS-HALL*

BETWEEN

G. KEITH, and Other *QUAKERS*.

AT the Opening of the Meeting, when *G. K.* ſtood up to make ſome Introductory Speech to give an Account of the Occaſion of the Meeting, *Henry Goldney*, with ſome other *Quakers* of *W. Pens* Party, came with a Printed Paper, giving ſome Reaſons why *W. Penn* and *Geo. Whitehead* did not appear, which he deſired might be read.

It was readily granted; and the Reaſons why *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead* did not appear, were read by *G. Keith*.

G. Keith. Now if ye think it has not been well read, let another read it, if you think fit; And I offer to Anſwer to every one of the Reaſons, if you deſire it.

The Auditory. No, it is needleſs.

G. Keith. This is their deſign, to divert us in our Buſineſs. The Reaſons are ſo ſlender, that I hope every Judicious Perſon here can anſwer them. If I am ſuch an angry perſon as they repreſent me, I ſhall lay my ſelf the more open, and they ſhall have the greater Advantage. You know well enough that they would be glad of any Advantage againſt me. And then for any Offence to Authority, as they ſuggeſt, I have the Lord Mayors leave; and he has ſent his Marſhal to preſerve the Peace, and therefore there can be nothing in that. Their Paper rather reflects upon Authority, the Authority of the Worthy Mayor of this Famous City; to whom I went, as I thought it was my Duty, to deſire leave for this Meeting; which he thought fit to conſent to, and has ſent his Marſhal to keep the Peace.

And I would have you take Notice now, that they, *viz. W. P.* and *G. W.* owa thoſe Books of *Thomas Elwoods*, *&c.* that are out againſt me, that I knew not before. I went to *G. Whitehead*, and deſired to know whether he owned a former Book of *Thomas Elwood* writ againſt me: He ſaid, he would neither own it, nor diſown it. And this is enough at preſent to Anſwer this Paper.

I hope in God, the Lord ſhall preſerve me, which has been my Prayer on my Knees this Morning, and many other times, that I might give no occaſion of Reproach to his Name or Truth, and that Religion may not be ſcandalized by any thing I ſhall ſpeak or act; and I hope my Prayers ſhall be anſwered.

They ſay, I did not exhibit to them a Copy of my Charge againſt them, (an Indictment they call it, they would repreſent me as a Man ſetting up a Spiritual Court) but my

my Printed Paper ſayes, W. Penn, *and* G. Whitehead, *are juſtly deſired to be preſent.* This is no Indictment nor Summons, as they falſly call it: And for the particulars I intend to prove againſt them, they were expreſly mentioned in my Printed Paper, called *An Advertiſement*, containing Four Fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity by them oppoſed. I deſired *W. Penn* to make good his Charge againſt me, in a former Printed Paper, which was, *That I was an Apoſtate and Impoſtour, endeavouring to pluck up the Teſtimony of Truth by the roots.* This he ſaid at a Meeting at *Ratcliffe*, above Fourteen Months ago, and while I was peaceably ſpeaking in that Meeting he interrupts me, and like a Clap of Thunder falls on me in the midſt of my Teſtimony, calls me, *Apoſtate*, &c. I deſired him alſo at the Yearly Meeting of the *Quakers* at *London* held 1695. to make good his Charge, and I told him, *If he refuſed, I would put him to prove it in the face of the Nation.* He juſtified his calling me *Apoſtate*, ſaying, *He was in no Paſſion, but he was ſo tranſported by the Glorious Power of God, that he knew not whether he was Standing, Sitting or Kneeling.* And ſince I have in Print deſired him to prove his Charge, and now at this Meeting; but he declines to appear. Ye know the ſaying, *Affirmanti incumbit probatio*, He ought to prove what he has affirmed.

Quaker. H. Goldnay. If thoſe that thou didſt ſummon, had appeared, I do not ſee thou hadſt provided any convenient place for them.

G. Keith. If your Friends had appeared, they might have had a place: There (pointing to a Table and a Bench ſet on it, oppoſite to the place where he ſtood) is a place provided for them: If you will fetch them, they ſhall have a place; or they might have been here with me where I ſtand.

Strangers that ſtood on the Table. If they come we will give place to them.

Quakers. N. M. and H. G. We came here to give an account that our Friends think not fit to be here, and have given their Reaſons for it.

G. Keith. It is a ſtrange thing that they cannot print a Paper, but muſt have ſo many Falſities in it. They call my Paper, *a Summons and an Indictment*, but I meant it not ſo. But to leave that, and come to our buſineſs

The four things which I charge them to be guilty of, are theſe; and I appeal to all moderate perſons, whether my intimation of ſuch a Meeting can be blamed, when it is to defend ſuch Points as theſe: *Faith in Chriſt as he outwardly ſuffered at* Jeruſalem *to our Salvation.* That is the Firſt. *Juſtification and Sanctification by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed.* That is the Second. *The Reſurrection of the Body that dieth.* The Third. *And Chriſts coming without us in his glorified Body, to judge the Quick and Dead.* That is the Fourth. All which have been contradicted by ſome of them, as *W. Penn, G. Whitehead, &c.* though theſe are Fundamental Principles belonging to the common Faith, and are generally owned by Chriſtians of all Profeſſions.

Now, if you pleaſe, I ſhall proceed to my Proofs Moſt of my buſineſs, whether they be here or not, is to read my Proofs out of their Books, that they are guilty of every one of theſe Four Errors oppoſing thereby Four Fundamental Truths.

The firſt is, *The neceſſity of Faith in Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered for us at* Jeruſalem. This is the firſt. But that this is oppoſed by them, I prove thus: The Object of Faith is oppoſed by them, and therefore the Faith it ſelf muſt needs be oppoſed. I hope the conſequence is clear enough. it needs no Proof.

The Object of Chriſtian Faith is Chriſt, both God and Man, and yet but one Chriſt. But ſo it is that I offer to prove, that *G. Whitehead*, and *W. Penn* by approving of *G. Whiteheads* Books, has denyed Chriſt both to be God and Man. This is the thing, which if I make out, I make out my firſt Point.

And firſt I offer to prove that *G. Whitehead* in a Book of his has denyed Chriſt to be God, and *W. Penn* has owned this Book: The Book is called, *Light and Life*, recommended by *William Penn* in his *Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 186. in Anſwer to *W. Burnet*, a *Baptiſt* Preacher, Printed, 1668. *P.* 47. Here he firſt brings in the *Baptiſts* words. Says the *Baptiſt*, *Now as he was God, he was Co-Creator with the Father, and ſo was before* Abraham; *and had Glory with God, before the World was, and in this ſenſe came down from Heaven.*

Now

Now here is *G. Whiteheads* reply, *What Nonſenſe and Unſcriptural Language is this? To tell of God being Co-Creator with the Father, or that God had glory with God? Does not this imply two Gods, and that God had a Father? Let the Reader judge.*

I ſhall read the *Baptiſts* words again, and ſee if there be any thing in them offenſive to Chriſtian Ears. I hope there are not many here but underſtand what *Co* ſignifieth, it is *with*. Now ſee if the words of the *Baptiſt* are offenſive to Chriſtian Ears; *As he was God, he was Co-Creator with the Father.* Ye know *John* ſaith, *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God, John* 1. 1, 2. See alſo *Prov.* 8. 22, 30. If theſe words offend any, let them ſpeak with all my Heart.

Quaker. N. Mark. If I might, I deſire to have liberty to ſpeak, when was the date of the Book?

Auditors. If you will undertake their cauſe, you may ſpeak, otherwiſe not.

Quaker. Pray hear me. The Reaſon why I askt him the date of the Book, is becauſe I believe it was a book antiently written; and *G. Keith* did write in Vindication of our Principles, and now for him to appear in oppoſition to our Principles, it appears that he has apoſtatized from our Principles.

G. Keith. Now let me Anſwer him I do ſay, if it were my laſt words, I know not that I ever read a line of this book till I came laſt to *England*, which is about Two Years. And if *G. Whitehead* be wiſer ſince, it is very well: But then he ſhould have retracted this. For this book, and ſome other books of his, has leavened the minds of many in *America*; as well as here, with Poyſonous Errors.

Stranger A Quaker. Then *George Keith* ought to make a candid and full Retractation of what he has ſaid contrary to Truth, before he appeared againſt them.

G. Keith. I own I have been miſtaken in theſe Men: But I hope this Auditory are ſufficient Judges of that, that if they cannot prove me to hold any Doctrine contrary to my former Principles, nor any Unchriſtian Principle, and that they have nothing againſt my Converſation, they ought not to call me an *Apoſtate*. I never heard that a Man was judged an Apoſtate for changing his Opinion of ſome Men, eſpecially when he finds cauſe ſo to do.

Quaker. You are fallen from your former Principles.

G. Keith. If you prove me not to have changed in any Fundamental Principle, ye ought not to charge me to be an Apoſtate. I know not any Fundamental Principle, nor indeed any one Principle of the Chriſtian Faith, that I have varied from to this day, ever ſince I came among the *Quakers*, which is about Thirty Three Years ago; therefore I ought to be cleared of that Imputation.

Quaker. H. Goldney, began to ſpeak.

G. Keith. Art thou deputed to Anſwer to what I have Charged them with?

Stranger. They have declined your Meeting, and yet ſeveral perſons (it ſeems) are deputed by them to ſpeak.

Auditors. G. Keith, go on with your Charge.

G. Keith. There is another paſſage in *G. Whiteheads* book wherein he denies the Divinity of Chriſt; and he deceives the Nation and the Parliament, by telling them, *They own Chriſt to be both God and Man, and believe all that is recorded of him in the Holy Scripture*, and no wonder he has deceived me. In his *pag.* 24. *Light and Life*, he ſaith, *To tell of the word God Co Creator with the Father, is all one as to tell of God being Co-Creator with God, if the Father be God, and thus is to make two Gods, two Creators*, &c. *For God Co-Creator with the Father, implyes two.* Ye ſee this is poſitive; and he puts this Cenſure on the *Baptiſts* words, *Thus Nonſenſe, Confuſion and Blaſphemy is heapt up againſt the Light within.*

Quaker. We tell you, that whereas *G. Keith* hath Printed ſeveral Books, they have Anſwered them from time to time; and he has left two Books unanſwered; and whatever he will print to the contrary, we will defend our Principles.

G. Keith. They have a Publick Stock, I have not; they are able to raiſe ſome Thouſands of Pounds ſooner than *G. Keith* can raiſe an Hundred.

[Here

[Here ſome Noiſe being raiſed in the Meeting by ſome diſcontented perſons.]

Auditors. Let there be a Moderator choſen.

G. Keith. If there be any Offence, do not charge it on me. I deſire you for the Honour of the Nation, and of the City of *London*, to be ſtill. It is a *Mob* from *Grace-church-ſtreet* to make a diſturbance.

Then that paſſage in *G. Whiteheads* book was read again.

See here the Son of God, his Eternal Generation is denyed. *If he had a Father, then there are two Gods.* And here is as plain a denying Chriſt to be God, as any *Socinian* can be guilty of.

Quaker. Nat. Mark. The caſual dropping of words is no proof.

G. Keith. I have proved to you already he diſowns Chriſt to be God. Now I will prove he has denyed him to be Man: And then there is that great Article of our Faith loſt, and the Object of the Chriſtian Faith denyed. Here is *G. Whiteheads* Anſwer to *T. Danſons Synopſis of Quakeriſm*, as he calls it, *p.* 18. This is in the book called, *The Divinity of Chriſt aſſerted*, (recommended by *W. Penn, Reaſon againſt Railing*, p. 185.)

See how *G. Whitehead* takes him up, and how he banters him: *If the Body and Soul of the Son of God were both created, doth not this render him a Fourth Perſon*, &c. But the ſtreſs I lay is in the words following; *But herein whether doth not his and their ignorance of the only begotten of the Father plainly appear: Where doth the Scripture ſay, that his Soul was created? For was not he the brightneſs of the Fathers glory, and the expreſs Image of his Divine Subſtance? But ſuppoſing the Soul of Chriſt was (with the Body) created in time*, &c. Here ye ſee, he will not own that Chriſt had a Created Soul. *Th. Danſon*, being a *Presbyterian* Miniſter did plead, *That Chriſt as Man had a created Soul.* This *G. W.* makes an inconſiſtency, as if he could not be God alſo. This was the Errour of *Apollinarius*, who ſaid, *Chriſt was without a Humane Soul, for he was the expreſs Image of his Father. But ſuppoſing the Soul of Chriſt were created with the Body*, &c. That which I would have you take notice of, is this, *Where does the Scripture ſay his Soul was created?*

Quaker. Waite. That was only a Queſtion.

G. Keith. Well, it was his way of Diſputing, as is ordinary to him, and many others. An ſuch way of Queſtioning plainly imporeteth a Denyal.

Next I prove, that *G. Whitehead* ſays, *He has not the Body of a Man.* And then I hope I ſhall have performed what I promiſed. See his *Nature of Chriſtianity*, p. 29, 41. Here I undertake to prove, that *G. Whitehead* denies that Chriſt in Heaven has any Bodily Exiſtence without us. If he has ſaid otherwiſe in any of his late Printed Books, I am glad of it. But let him retract theſe, for theſe have done much miſchief. Now when I ſaid he was Orthodox, I mean not as he was Heterodox: For there is a *G. Whitehead* Orthodox, and a *G. Whitehead* not Orthodox: I did not know *G. Whitehead* not Orthodox till lately. I do not ſay there are two perſons in *George Whitehead*; he is but one and the ſame perſon, (in this and ſome other things) Orthodox and not Orthodox, *George Whitehead* contradicting *George Whitehead*; he is accountable for theſe Coutradictions and not I. I own it, that I have cited divers paſſages out of his later books that are Orthodox to prove him ſound; but I did not then know, when I ſo cited him, that he was guilty of ſuch groſs Errors, as ſince I have found by a further ſearch into his books. Let him retract his Errors, and well enjoy his Orthodoxy. Ye know contradictory Propoſitions cannot be both true.

I ſhall read to you, *p.* 29, 41. of his *Nature of Chriſtianity*. (This is poſteriour to his former book). In *Page* 29. *Or doſt thou look for Chriſt, as the Son of* Mary, *to appear outwardly in a Bodily Exiſtence to ſave thee, according to thy words*, page 30. *If thou doſt, thou mayſt look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt ſee ſuch an appearance of him.* This is but one place, that is, that Chriſt will not ſo appear. But why will he not ſo appear, but becauſe he has no Bodily Exiſtence without us. That I come now to prove; for

for which I ſhall read to you in his *pag.* 41. " And that he exiſteth outwardly, bodily, without us at God's right Hand: What Scripture Proof hath he for theſe Words? And then " what and where is God's right Hand? Is it viſible or inviſible? within us, or without us only? " And is Chriſt the Saviour, as an outward bodily Exiſtence or Perſon without us, diſtinct " from God, and on that Conſideration to be worſhipped as God, yea or nay? And where " doth the Scripture ſay he is outwardly and bodily glorified at God's right Hand? Do theſe " Days expreſs the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began, in which he is " now glorified? And where doth the Scripture ſay? *And here is the thing that rivets.* " Where " doth the Scripture ſay, that he is outwardly and bodily glorified at God's right Hand? Do " theſe Terms expreſs the Glory that he had with the Father before the World began?

Now *G. Whitehead*'s way of writing, is to queſtion his Adverſaries, which is the Socratical way of diſputing and arguing againſt his Adverſary.

But let me go on. Again, ſee his Book called, *Chriſt aſcended above the Clouds.* All that I have yet cited out of *G. Whitehead*'s Books, *Light and Life*, and that of *the Divinity of Chriſt*, and *Nature of Chriſtianity*, *W. Penn* has own'd them all in his *Reaſons againſt Railing*, *pag.* 185, 186. This Book was printed, (and alſo this called *Chriſt aſcended above the Clouds*) *Anno* 1669. Now for the Page and Matter, *p.* 21, 22. *John Newman* his Opponent's Words were from *Rev.* 1. 7. *Thoſe that pierced him in his Body of Fleſh, ſhall ſee that Body viſibly come again.* *G. W.* anſwereth, *Theſe are not the Words of Scripture*, but added, *Altho to add or diminiſh be forbidden under a Penalty*, Rev. 22. 18, 19. *yet this Man's Preſumption leads him to incur that;*——*And Chriſt in the Days of his Fleſh* (when he viſibly appeared to the World) *ſaid, Yet a little while and the World ſeeth me no more.* Now again I ſhall read to you *John Newman*'s Words which *G. W.* doth ſo much blame: From *Rev.* 1. 7. *Thoſe that pierced him in his Body of Fleſh, ſhall ſee that Body viſibly come again.* Is there any thing here offenſive? Nothing but what is the declared Opinion of the Church of *Rome*, the Church of *England*, the Presbyterians, Independents, Baptiſts, and mine, all along, tho I have been a Quaker near about 34 Years.

Quaker. Then it is much that in 34 Years thou ſhouldſt not correct them before.

G. Keith. This Aſſertion that *G. Whitehead* charges with Hereſy, ſee how he anſwers it; *Theſe are not the Words of Scripture, but added, altho to add or diminiſh be forbidden under a Penalty.* Why, *John Newman* here only uſes the word *Body* to his coming again, and *G. Whitehead* finds fault with that; and *G. W.* brings a Proof from *John* 14. 19. *Yet a little while and the World ſeeth me no more:* that thoſe that pierced Chriſt in his Body ſhall not ſee that Body viſibly come again. Here is a Proof that Chriſt was evaniſhed: *The World ſhall ſee me no more.* The Tranſlation will not prove *G. Whitehead*'s Poſition even as it is. But it may be better tranſlated *as yet, Yet a little while and the World ſhall not ſee me: As yet*, the Greek being ἔτι οὐκ, οὐκ is *not*, ἔτι *yet*, *i. e. nondum*, or *not as yet.* Does this prove that Chriſt has no Body at all? This is very bad Reaſoning.

Quaker. If the Tranſlation be not good, why do you make uſe of it?

† Note, *There is an additional Poſtſcript by me* G. K. *put to this Book of* G. W. Nature of Chriſtianity, *the which Poſtſcript I left in a Manuſcript at* London, *and with the Quakers, printed with this of* G. W. *I acknowledg my want of due Conſideration that I did not better conſider* G. W. *his Words in that Book, having many Years ago read it, but too overly, and not having ſeen it ſince, for many Years, till of late: but I am ſure I did really then believe, (as I now do) that Chriſt as Man did outwardly and bodily exiſt without us; for Proof of which ſee my Words in that additional Poſtſcript above-mentioned,* p. 73. *where at* n. 11. *I blame* R. G. *for ſaying, That the now preſent glorified Exiſtence of that* Body (*or Man Chriſt*) *that ſuffered at* Jeruſalem, *is denied by ſome Teachers among us. I confeſs I happened to find divers Paſſages in* G. W's, *and other Quakers Books, that ſeemed to me unſound; but in an Exceſs of Charity I did conſtrue them to be better meant than worded, and that they had rather unwarily ſlipped from them, than that they were the Expreſſions of their unſound Mind, until that of late I had found them to juſtify the ſame, and the like unſound Words, in my Adverſaries in* Penſilvania, *and to hate and excommunicate me for telling them of them.*

G. Keith. I own it a good Tranſlation, and Thanks be to God we have ſuch a Tranſlation; yet that in ſome Places it may be better tranſlated, the Quakers themſelves, as well as all other Profeſſions, do acknowledg, (ſuch as have a little Hebrew or Greek) that is one Place. There are two or three Places more. I will give you only a few of my Proofs, and leave the reſt to a further Opportunity. *P.* 24. ſays *J. Newman*, " By denying any perſo-" nal being of Chriſt, without all Men, at the right Hand of God, but only a feigned " Chriſt within, then Remiſſion of Sins muſt die, and Faith alſo, for want of the Object " of Chriſt. This I look on to be good Doctrine. And if you deny that, (*G. K.* turning himſelf to his Opponents, *Henry Goldney* and *Nathaniel Marke*, who ſpoke by turns, ſometimes one, and ſometimes another, and ſtood cloſe by him in the Gallery, a Favour his Adverſaries would ſcarce have allowed to him, in any ſuch Diſpute, at *Grace-Church-ſtreet*-Meeting-place, or elſewhere) ye may ſpeak; to which they not replying, *G. K.* further ſaid, I think this is a good Deduction. Now to this *G. Whitehead* anſwers, *p.* 29. (I defend not *J. Newman* in all he owns, but ſo far as he holds the Truth: And if a Papiſt ſay the Truth againſt a Jew, I am ingaged to defend him in it) ' This manner of excluding God's right Hand ' and Chriſt to a Limitation out of his People in a *perſonal Being*, which are no Scripture-terms, ' ſtill implies him to be a perſonal God or Chriſt, like the Anthropomorphites and Muggle-' tonians Conceits of him. And again, *pag.* 69. he ſaith: And theſe Words, *Chriſt in Perſon ' remote in his Body of Fleſh*, &c. *and not in any Man*, are not Scripture, but added. What ' ſtrange Conceits would *J. N.* put upon the unlimited God, like the old heretical Monks of ' *Egypt*, called *Anthropomorphites*. By theſe Words of *G. W.* all Papiſts, Church of *England*-men, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptiſts, who believe that the Man Chriſt has any bodily Exiſtence in Heaven, as he thinks, are Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians. So you ſee all of you are Muggletonians as well as I.

But mark the Words of *John Newman* above-mentioned, which are found; and I ſay, whoever under a Chriſtian Profeſſion deny Chriſt to have any perſonal or bodily Exiſtence without us in Heaven, whatever Notion they may have of Chriſt within, it is but a feigned Chriſt within; but who have the true Knowledg and Faith of Chriſt within, to wit, of his Spirit, Light and Grace within, that leads them to own and confeſs to the Man Chriſt without, as well as to his Spirit within. There is no Church-of-*England*-man, Presbyterian or Baptiſt, *&c.* that holds that Notion, that the Godhead has the Shape of a Man; but the Manhood of Chriſt has the true Nature of Man. And what Shape Chriſt's Body has now, that I leave, but I believe he has the ſelf-ſame Body in Heaven that he had on Earth; the ſame I ſay for Subſtance and Eſſence of Body, tho wonderfully changed in Manner and Condition.

Another Quaker. Then you reflect on an Act of Parliament which allows the Tranſlation of the Scriptures, if they be not truly tranſlated. [*Note*, This Man's Impertinency and Prejudice, as if to ſay a Place of Scripture may be better tranſlated, which all the Learned of all Profeſſions of Engliſh Proteſtants do allow, were a Reflection on the Parliament: how earneſt is this Man with other of his Brethren, to make the Innocent an Offender? Is this your Chriſtianity?]

G. Keith. Here is a Book of *G. Whitehead*'s, called, *The He-goats Horn broken.* I hope this Meeting will give Satisfaction to many; and therefore that it may be profitable, I deſire you to keep Silence.

Quaker N. Mark. I have a Propoſition to make. I would not interrupt, but I deſire to be heard, if I may have leave.

G. Keith. Will you (ſpeaking to them all four that ſpoke ſometimes one and ſometimes another) take upon you to vindicate your Friends? then you may ſay what you will.

Quaker. George, I deſire thy Leave to be heard.

G. Keith. If you will but ſpeak briefly.

Quaker N. Mark. The Propoſition is this: 1. I tell you I am here accidentally. 2. I obſerve that *G. Keith* takes the Liberty of putting his own Interpretation on the Paſſages of ſeveral Books; and ſince *G. K.* has departed from the Quakers, he has taken on him to write ſeveral Books, which are extant; and over and over he makes his Appeal to this

Aſſem-

Assembly; which I desire you to consider how improper and impracticable it is to decide it here. Therefore what he purposed to urge here, if he will print it, and proceed no further in this Meeting, I will be at the Charge of whatever he shall print.

G. Keith. I say, If he would lay me down five hundred Pounds, I would not break up this Meeting till it is over.

Stranger. He will pay for it, *i. e. N. Marks.*

G. Keith. But it is upon Terms.

Quaker, Began to speak, [thus they oft sought to interrupt him to divert the Proofs.]

G. Keith. Thou knowest thou art not so qualified to speak in this Auditory. Let me go on with my Proofs. I prove further, that *G. Whitehead* writing against one *Jo. Horn,* reflects on him scornfully, he calls his Book *the He-goats Horn broken.* Now see whether *G. Whitehead* has not broken his own Horn rather. It is a Shame, the Reflections they have made on Men sounder than themselves. Let me read the Words; *The He-goats Horn broken, or Innocency,* &c. *in answer to two Books against the Quakers,* Printed, *London,* 1660. Now if I understand any thing of true Divinity or Theology, the Passage this Man or Men (for there are two of them) lays down here, is a sound Passage, which *G. Whitehead* contradicts. Now here is the Passage, and do you judg of it. *And where we lay down this as* Tho. Moor's *Principle,* That their Nature is restored in Christ, and that their Nature is a filthy Nature. This they say is falsly expressed and perverted, and yet *J. H.* and *T. M.* a little after say thus, *viz.* That our Nature, Kind or Being, as in us, not in Christ, is corrupt and filthy in it self; yet Christ took upon him our Nature, not as it is filthy in us by Sin in it. And they say, That we might as well have taxed the Apostle of Confusion, for saying, *Men by Nature do the things contained in the Law*; p. 11, 12. Now here is *G. Whitehead*'s Answer, 'We may justly 'tax these Men for Confusion indeed, but not the Apostle; for here they cannot discern be-'tween the sinful Nature and the pure Nature, for the Nature of Christ is pure; so that it's 'not their Nature, for their Nature is filthy, and therefore it is not in Christ. Observe, Christ did not take upon him *Jo. Horn*'s Nature. No, says he. As I have oft told *G. Whitehead,* that he and *W. Penn* will needs imbrace false Notions in Philosophy, they will needs seem to be Philosophers by Divine Inspiration, as well as Ministers and Preachers by it. But it is a sad thing, that their false Philosophy should destroy their Faith. Now here is a false Notion, that Christ could not take on him Man's Nature, except he took on him the Pollution of it. As if the Pollution of Sin were an essential Attribute of Man's Nature. Now Sin, if it be like Scarlet, is no more essential to the Nature of Man, than Filth to a Garment: for a Garment is the same Garment still, whether it be filthy or clean. Therefore I say, our blessed Lord might well take on him our Nature, and the Nature in us be sinful, and in him pure and holy. And *Jo. Horn* distinguishes so. Now judg ye whether *G. Whitehead* has broken *Jo. Horn*'s Horn, yea or no; or rather whether has he not broken his own Horn?

Thus I have done as to the Object of Faith, at present at least. Now I come to the Act of Faith, or the Vertue of Faith. See for the Proofs, *William Penn* his *Quakerism,* a new Nick-name for old Christianity, *p.* 12. Printed *Anno* 1672. This Book is without the Printer's Name, and most of *W. Penn*'s Books are without it, tho they persecuted *William Bradford* in *Philadelphia* for printing some of my Books without putting his Name. Here is the Point, *Jo. Faldo* makes this Charge against the Quakers, *p.* 12. Christianity was introduced by preaching the promised Messiah, and pointing at his humane Person, but Quakerism by preaching a Light within. Now if I had this to answer, I would have said, Any Quakerism I know of, that I learned, was introduced into my Heart both by believing in Christ without, and in Christ within, (at once, and by one Faith) but instead of that he answers thus: "I answer, That this is nothing injurious to the Quakers at all, but highly on their "side, for had they preach'd a Christ now coming in the Flesh, they had denied his true "and only great visible Appearance at *Jerusalem,* which all true Quakers own. Since then "they believe that Appearance, but therefore need not preach what is not to be again: And that the whole Christian World besides have so long and lazily depended on it, without their thirsting after his inward holy Appearance in the Conscience, *&c.*

This is the thing I come to; Since then they believe that Appearance, but therefore need not preach what is not to be again; if every one of them believe there was such a Man that was born of a Virgin, and died for our Sins sixteen hundred Years ago, they therefore need not preach that he was so born, or that he died for our Sins, *&c.* Christ is not to be born again, is not to die again, *&c.* We need not preach it, but throw it over the Shoulder, and give it up and bury it in Oblivion from Posterity. Judg if this be not the true Consequence. Let them retract these Errors, and not say I am an Apostate for telling them of them: As I told *G. Whitehead*, there are Errors in thy Books as well as others, and either thou or I must correct them, and he was very angry with me. Let them retract them, and not count me a Liar for telling them of them. But let me again read out the entire Paragraph. *Since then they believe that Appearance, but therefore need not preach what is not to be again.* There it clinches, they need not preach what is not to be again *. Take notice also of his uncharitable dealing here; if he had said many, it might have past. But he says the whole Christian World has lazily depended on it. Is there none in the Christian World but the *Quakers*, that thirst after the Power of God in their Souls? I was never so uncharitable to think so. There is more yet, *p.* 6. *The Distinction between Moral and Christian. The making holy Life legal*, (I know none that do so of any that are sincere in all the Professions in *Christendom*) *and Faith in the History of Christ's outward Manifestation, has been a deadly Poison these latter Ages have been infected with, to the Destruction of Godly Living, and apostatizing of those Churches*, &c. Another Proof I bring against *W. Penn* is out of his Address to Protestants, *p.* 119. printed 1692. the second Edition corrected and enlarged: But this Passage remains in it however. I will begin a little before the main thing: *For it seems*, p. 118. *a most unreasonable thing, that Faith in God, and in keeping his Commands should be no part of the Christian Religion: But if a part it be, as upon serious Reflection who dare deny it, then those before and since Christ's time who never had the external Law, and have done the things contained in the Law, their Consciences not accusing, nor Hearts condemning, but excusing them before God, are in some degree concerned in the Character of a true Christian; for Christ himself preached and kept his Father's Commandments, and came to fulfil and not destroy the Law, and that not only in his own Person, but that the Righteousness of the Law might also be fulfilled in us.* Now comes the main thing. *Let us but soberly consider what Christ is, and we shall the better know, whether Moral Men are to be reckon'd Christians. What is Christ but Meekness, Justice, Mercy, Patience, Charity, and Vertue in Perfection? Can we then deny a meek Man to be a Christian, a just, a merciful, a patient, a charitable and vertuous Man to be like Christ?* But in this way of arguing there is a Fallacy; these Moral Vertues are a Part of a Christian, as Animal is a part of the Definition of a Man, and belong to the Genus of a Christian. But there are two things in the true Definition of a Man, the *Genus* and the *Differentia*: they have the *Genus*, but not the *Differentia*; therefore it is true to say, every Man is an Animal; but it is not true nor good Logick to say, every Animal is a Man. *Let us but soberly consider* (saith *William Penn*) *what Christ is, what is Christ but Meekness, and Justice, and Mercy, and Patience?* And now take notice, (I would not misconstrue what I have read) by *William Penn*'s Argument, a Man may be own'd to be a Christian, and yet disbelieve that Christ is either God or Man; if he own or practise a Habit or Quality of Moral Vertue, as that of Justice, and Meekness, *&c.* and practise accordingly,

* *And by this same Argument they need not preach his Example of holy Life, nor the Example of the holy Lives of the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, nor the Creation of the World, nor any of God's gracious Providences towards his Church and People in former Ages, they all being past, and Persons not to live again in Mortal Bodies. But why do the Quakers labour to keep up the the Remembrance of their deceased Friends, and their Works and Sayings, and collect them in Print for Posterity? Is not the keeping in Memory the Birth, Life, Death and Resurrection, &c. of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ infinitely of more Value to be remembred? and what is the way to have it remembred (according to God's ordinary manner of working) if not by preaching? O what great Blindness and Ignorance is this of* W. Penns!

accordingly, tho he believe not in Christ, if he have but some Moral Habits: So that here the Jew is the Christian, the Mahometan is the Christian, the Pagan is the Christian, and the professed Pelagian is the Christian, tho they deny any inward supernatural Principle, and call the Light within only natural, as many sober and moral Men do; why then have they so fiercely contended against such Men, denying them to be Christians, in whom as much of Morality has appeared as in many of them? But it is strange to heathenise all Christendom through, calling them the World, and christianise Heathens for their Morality. See again the *Christian Quaker*, p. 125, 126, 127. let me but recommend it to you to read the Book. This *Christian Quaker* it is a Folio Book, he bestows about three Pages to define what a Christian Quaker is. In all this large Definition, not one word of the Man Christ (who is God over all blessed for ever) to be the Object, either of this Christian Quaker's Faith, Love or Homage: it is too large to recite, but I recommend it to you to read it, and shall go to the next.

Again, see the Preface to *R. Barclay*'s great Volume, *p.* 36. where he makes the Work of Regeneration greater than the Manifestation of the Son of God in the Flesh. *R. Barclay* is my Country-man, I will not be partial to him on that account; but I do not now blame any thing in his Book, I know he is the soundest Writer among them. But the thing I blame, is a Preface supposed to be writ by *W. Penn*, and, however, commended by *G. Whitehead* and some others: By the Stile it is thought to be *W. Penn*'s, and it commonly goes under his Name. These are the Words: *O Reader! great is the Mystery of Godliness! And if the Apostle said it of the Manifestation of the Son of God in the Flesh, if that be a Mystery, (and if a Mystery, it is not to be spelt out but by the Revelation of the Spirit) how much more is the Work of Regeneration a Mystery, that is wholly inward and spiritual in its Operation? Who is sufficient for these things?* Now pray take notice, that I tell you, I cast no Reflection on *R. Barclay*, I blame nothing at present in his Books, tho there may be things both in his Books and mine that may need Correction. If there be any Reflection on him, it is chiefly this, that such an unsound Preface should be put to his Book, for I can sufficiently prove, that *R. Barclay*'s Doctrine is plainly Antipodes to this Doctrine *. O Reader, *great is the Mystery of Godliness*; for which is cited 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. *Great is the Mystery of Godliness, God manifest in the Flesh*, &c. which all Christendom judg to be God manifest in Christ's outward Body of Flesh, and but consequentially of his Spirit and Grace in Men: and I think it's the greatest Mystery next to that of the Holy Three in One, and One in Three; the Manifestation of the Son of God in that Body of Flesh is next to that. Now you see how he makes Regeneration in a Believer a greater Mystery than the Manifestation of the Son of God in his Body of Flesh; *How much more*, saith he, *is the Work of Regeneration a Mystery?* For the other here, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. he does not say it is a Mystery, but he puts three *ifs* to it, *If a Mystery*, &c. Pray was our blessed Lord a mere Shell? Was he like the Shell of an Egg without the Meat of an Egg? or was he like the Shell of any Fruit, and no Kernel in it? Was there any Holiness ever in any Prophet or Apostle, but it is like a Drop to the Ocean to what was in our blessed Lord? Therefore to compare the Work of Regeneration to the Incarnation of our Lord,

C

* *See his and my Answer to the Students in* Aberdeer, *called* Quakerism confirmed, *in the Collection of his Works, called,* Truth triumphant, pag. 627. Prop. 3. he say, "*That the same* "*Seed and Life is in us which was in him,* (*viz.* the Man Christ) *and is in him in the Fulness, as* "*Water in the Spring, and in us as the Stream.*——*As the natural Life is in all the Members, but* "*more principally in the Head and Heart, without any Division; so this spiritual Life and Nature* "*is both in Christ our Head, and in us, by which he dwelleth in us, as the Spirit of Man doth in the* "*Body.*

Again, p. 628. Prop. 10. *As for the Satisfaction of Christ without us, we own it against the Socinians,* &c. *And* pag. 629. *The Doctrines of the Incarnation, Sufferings, Death and Resurrection of Christ,* &c. *are necessary every where to be preached: See the Places at more length, than which nothing can be more contradictory than* W. Penn's *Doctrine, as will appear in divers Places in this Treatise, from his own Words faithfully quoted out of his Books.*

ſo as to equal it, (he prefers it, and does not equal it only) I appeal to you, whether is it not a moſt abominable Error, and whether it doth not make every regenerate Man not only equal to the Man Chriſt, but greater; for we truly value any Man as more holy, according as the Manifeſtation of God is more in one Man than in another. It is not enough, to ſay, he has unadviſedly dropt this Doctrine, but it is his main Aim in divers of his Books: See *W. Penn*'s *Rejoinder*, p. 330, 337, 340. where he makes Chriſt in the Gentiles a greater Myſtery than Chriſt incarnate, *p.* 335. *J. Faldo* is now in his Grave; and I confeſs I never thought I ſhould be raiſed up to vindicate *J. Faldo*. I cannot ſay I ever read the fourth Part of this Book of *W. Penn*'s called his *Rejoinder*, till within this two Twelve-months. But if *J. Faldo* ſpeak Truth againſt my Father, I muſt defend him againſt my Father. Hear what *J. Faldo* ſays, *p.* 100, 101. *For Chriſt to be in the Gentiles, rightly underſtood, would be no hard Matter for the Gentiles to believe, as to believe ſuch a Glory to be attain'd by Faith in, and Obedience to the Laws of a Man, who died as a Malefactor, and that this Death of his ſhould reconcile God to Man, with the Addition of ſuch a Purchaſe* To this *W. Penn* anſwereth, 'This ſort of Do-'ctrine well becometh John Faldo, *I perceive I have not miſtaken him.* What Carnaliſt in the 'World could have let drop a more pernicious Sentence to the Doctrine and Kingdom of 'Chriſt, than to render it more difficult to believe, and lay a greater ſtreſs upon the external 'than the internal Work of Chriſt? we muſt read the moſt weighty Scriptures backwards 'upon this Man's Principles, he hath helped us to a new way of rendring the Text; not this 'Myſtery among the Gentiles is Chriſt in you the Hope of Glory, but this Myſtery among 'the Gentiles is a Man who died as a Malefactor, by his Death reconciled to God, *&c.* Be-'hold your Expoſitor! I dare warrant this Man's Comment will never trouble the next Col-'lection of Criticks. At this rate the Lord, Lord Criar is highly privileged, and the Gala-'tians had paſſed the moſt difficult Birth before they had known Chriſt to be formed in them. 'Regeneration is a ſlight thing in compariſon of the Knowledg of Chriſt after the Fleſh. 'This Doctrine brings not Men to Chriſt in them the Hope of Glory, but inticeth them into 'the vain Hope of the Hypocriſy which periſheth: the Hiſtory is made the greateſt Myſtery; 'and to believe the one, matter of greater Difficulty than to experience the other.——'Tis 'ſtrange that ſhould be reputed moſt myſterious which was the Introduction to the Myſtery, 'and thoſe Tranſactions counted moſt difficult that were by the Divine Wiſdom of God or-'dained as ſo many facile Repreſentations of what was to be accomplithed in Man.

'In ſhort, it is to leſſen if not totally to exclude the true Myſtery of Godlineſs, which is 'Chriſt manifeſted in his Children, their Hope of Glory.

We had wont to ſay, All other Profeſſions denied Chriſt within, but here *J. Faldo* owns Chriſt to be in the Gentiles rightly underſtood. But to me Chriſt crucified, in whom the Fulneſs dwell th, is a greater Myſtery, and a greater Matter to be believed. I can ſhew many of the Philoſophers that owned the Light within, under the Denomination of the Word, Light, Spirit, *&c.* yet it was ſo hard for them to believe that a Man that was crucified as a Malefactor ſhould die for their Sins. Yea *Julian* the Apoſtate, and *Porphirius*, profeſſed and owned a Divine Principle within, [as generally the Platoniſt Philoſophers did, and *Ariſtotle* alſo] but Chriſt crucified they could not away with. And now it is a Stumbling-block to theſe Quakers. *This ſort of Doctrine well becomes* J. Faldo. See how he banters him. *W. Penn* thinks it is a Matter of little or no Difficulty to believe God ſent Chriſt to die for Sinners, and to reconcile God to Men by his Death. But Chriſt told the Jews, *This is the Work of God*, John 6. 29. *that ye believe on him whom he hath ſent* And ſurely that was the Man Chriſt Jeſus. And he ſaid alſo, *No Man can come unto me, except the Father which hath ſent me draw him*, John 6. 44. *And every one that has heard and learned of the Father comes to me*, ver. 45. Now to come to him is the ſame as to believe in him with a true ſaving Faith. So that it is plain, he teaches the Jews that they cannot believe in Chriſt (that appeared outwardly among them) whom God has ſent, but as they are taught of God and drawn of him. And yet *W. Penn* makes it inferiour to Regeneration, as you may ſee by his Words: [Whereas true ſaving Faith in Chriſt crucified, who died as a Malefactor, to reconcile us to God, is a great and principal Part of Regeneration, and is as great a Work of God, as to make us believe Chriſt's inward Appearance in us]. But ſays *William Penn*,

'Behold

" Behold your Expoſitor! I dare warrant this Man's Comment will never trouble the next " Collection of Criticks, *&c.* A rare way to refute him, to banter him at this rate. Now I will give you my Senſe. I do not reckon *J. Faldo* was ſo ignorant a Man, that he believed a Man could be a Chriſtian only with a traditional Knowledg or Faith of Chriſt without him. But tho Regeneration is no ſlight thing, yet I ſay, comparing Chriſt's Incarnation, that is a Complex of Myſteries, (a certain Writer ‖ ſhews a Complex of twenty and more Myſteries in that one Myſtery of Chriſt's Incarnation) I ſay, comparing that with the Work of Regeneration, I do affirm the Work of Regeneration is a light thing, tho not light in it ſelf. Therefore this of *W. Penn* is but a mere Banter. There is none of all the Church-of-*England*-men, or Independents, or Presbyterians, ſay the mere hiſtorical, literal, traditional Faith of Chriſt will ſave any. But the Matter is, there is a ſaving Faith of Chriſt without us; and Chriſt without us as he is both God and Man, the Emanuel, as well as his inward Appearance in us, is the Object of ſaving Faith; but theſe Men would not own it. I deſire you well to mark and conſider the ſeveral Paſſages in this whole Paragraph of *William Penn*'s Rejoinder, what groſs and abſurd things it contains. He ſaith, This Doctrine brings not Men to Chriſt in them the Hope of Glory, but inticeth them into the vain Hope of the Hypocrite which periſheth. Yea ſee how he makes it the vain Hope of the Hypocrite to believe that Chriſt without is a greater Myſtery than Chriſt within; that's Hiſtory, this is Myſtery, according to him.

‖ *This Writer is* J. Reuclinus de verbo mirifico, lib. 3. cap. 2.

Now I have ſome other principal Proofs yet remaining about this groſs Error of *W. Penn*. I ſhall read to you in his *Chriſtian Quaker*, a Paſſage, *p* 97, 98. printed *Anno* 1674. but the Printer's Name is not to it. " To conclude, as *Abraham* outward and natural, was the " great Father of the Jews, whoſe Seed God promiſed to bleſs with Earthly Bleſſings, as " *Canaan*, &c. and that they were figurative of the one Seed Chriſt, and ſuch as he ſhould " beget unto a lively Hope through the Power of his Spiritual Reſurrection; it will conſequently follow, that this Seed muſt be inward and ſpiritual, ſince one outward thing " cannot be the proper Figure or Repreſentation of another, nor is it the way of holy " Scripture ſo to teach us. The outward Lamb ſhews forth the inward Lamb; the Jew " outward, the Jew inward. As God attended the one with many ſingular outward Mercies " (to ſay no more) above other Nations; ſo the Jew in Spirit doth he benefit above all " other People.

" I have theſe two ſhort Arguments to prove what I believe and aſſert as to the Spirituality of the true Seed, and a clearer Overthrow it is to the Opinion of our Adverſaries to " the true Chriſt.

" *Firſt*, Every thing begets its like; what is ſimply natural produces not a ſpiritual Being; material things bring not forth things that are immaterial. Now becauſe the Nature, " or Image begotten in the Hearts of true Believers, is ſpiritual, it will follow, if the Seed " which ſo begets, and brings forth that Birth, muſt be the ſame in nature with that which " is begotten, therefore ſpiritual; then Chriſt's Body, or what he had from the Virgin, " ſtrictly conſidered as ſuch, was not the Seed.

" *Secondly*, It is clear from hence, the Serpent is a Spirit: Now nothing can bruiſe the " Head of the Serpent, but ſomething that is ſo internal and ſpiritual as the Serpent is. " But if that Body of Chriſt were the Seed, then could he not bruiſe the Serpent's Head " in all, becauſe the Body of Chriſt is not ſo much as in any one, and conſequently the Seed " of the Promiſe is an holy and ſpiritual Principle of Light, Life and Power, that being " received into the Heart, bruiſeth the Serpent's Head: And becauſe the Seed, " which cannot be that Body, is Chriſt, as teſtify the Scriptures, the Seed is *Gal.* 3. 16. " one, and that Seed Chriſt, and Chriſt God over all, bleſſed for ever. We " do conclude, and that moſt truly, that Chriſt was and is the Divine Word of Light and " Life, that was in the Beginning with God, and was and is God over all, bleſſed for ever. *W. Penn* will needs have this to be not Chriſt without but Chriſt within. *And you ſee his Arguments.*

" So

" So the Paſchal Lamb was no Figure of Chriſt without. And when *John* ſaid, *Behold* " *the Lamb of God!* it was meant of Chriſt within us, not of Chriſt without us, for our " Paſſover is ſlain for us. You ſee, according to *W. Penn*, that Paſſover that was ſlain for us, was ſlain in us, not without us: And ſo they throw away our Arguments againſt the Jews: the Jews may plead the *Meſſiah* is not yet come. [The Light within is owned by the Jews, and their Rabbies ſpeak highly of it, yea, they call it a Ray or Beam of the Heavenly *Adam*; and by way of Allegory, his Fleſh and Blood, as I can plainly prove out of their Writings. And if the Types and Prophecies of the Old Teſtament mean only the Light within, by the one Seed that was promiſed, and held forth under theſe Types, how ſhall we convince them that the *Meſſiah* is come? and that becauſe he is come, theſe Types, Figures and Shadows of the Law are aboliſhed.]

W. Penn ſaith, *Then Chriſt's Body he had from the Virgin, ſtrictly conſidered as ſuch, was not the Seed.* This is rare Logick. Here is a Fallacy, but I believe it proceeds not from any Deſign, but from his Weakneſs in Logick. You know there ſhould be no Term nor Thing of Importance in the Concluſion of any Syllogiſm or Argument, but what ſhould be in the Premiſes; but *ſtrictly conſidered* is not in the Premiſes, therefore it ſhould not be in the Concluſion. No Man ſays, the Body of Chriſt ſtrictly conſidered without the Soul of Chriſt is Chriſt, or that either the Soul and Body of Chriſt ſtrictly conſidered, without the Godhead, is the Chriſt. Therefore he fights againſt a Man of Straw. But the Senſe of his Argument is, that his Body was no Part of him. The one Seed cannot be an outward thing, this ye ſee is univerſal and excluſive of any outward thing; for ſays *W. Penn*, one outward Thing cannot be the proper Figure or Repreſentation of another.——Again, Nothing (ſaith he) can bruiſe the Head of the Serpent but ſomething that is alſo internal and ſpiritual, as the Serpent is. And whereas *W. Penn* ſaith, The Body of Chriſt is not ſo much as in any one; this contradicts his Brother *John Whitehead*, that ſays, He denieth that Chriſt hath a Body out of every Man on Earth. Here is their Contradiction, and yet they both pretend to be infallible.

‖ *But is not the Serpent or Devil without Men as well as within many Men?*

But ſee what a Sorites is here, ſaith *W. Penn:* The Seed is one, and that Seed Chriſt, and Chriſt God over all, bleſſed for ever. We do conclude, and that moſt truly, that Chriſt was and is the divine Word of Light and Life that was in the Beginning with God, and was and is God over all, bleſſed for ever. Thus you ſee he makes the promiſed Seed to be nothing but an inward Principle, God over all, *&c.*

But I think it is not true, to ſay, The Seed of God in Men is God; I judg it is unſound Doctrine, and contradicts *R. B.* who calleth that inward Seed, *Vehiculum Dei*, the Vehicle of God. But to ſay, Chriſt is only God, and not Man without us, as *W. Penn*'s way of arguing imports, is moſt falſe Doctrine, and is as great and dangerous an Extream as to ſay, Chriſt is only Man and not God. But the true Chriſtian Doctrine is, that Chriſt is both God and Man, and yet one Chriſt. I have done at preſent with my firſt Head.

Quaker N. M. Then you will admit of a ſhort Appeal. I appeal to the Perſons here met, preſuming upon their *Generoſity* and *Temper*, how unfair it is for him to make his Illuſtrations and Aggravations of theſe Matters, and to how great Difficulty he expoſes thoſe Perſons he treats of. I think what he ſays to you is inconſiſtent with Chriſtian Principles, ſhould be read by another Perſon: for many things are explanatory of one another, *&c.*

Qua. Henry Goldney alſo blamed his reading, that what made againſt him he read low, but what he thought made for him he read high.

G. Keith. If any of you ſcruple my reading, if you deſire it, another ſhall read: Only there is this Inconvenience, I have not the Places ſo well marked on the Margin that another can ſo readily find them as my ſelf. But if I wrong the Quotations, it will appear in Print, for we intend that the Quotations ſhall be printed.

Stranger. Let him overlook you, if he thinks you do not read right.

Quaker N. M. I think he does not read falſe.

G. Keith. The ſecond Head is Juſtification and Sanctification by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, which is oppoſed by *William Penn*, *G. Whitehead*, and others. For this I ſhall bring

bring my Proofs. *Reason against Railing*, by W. Penn, *pag.* 91. *And forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.* Says *W. Penn*, 'Where nothing can be 'more obvious, than that which is forgiven, is not paid; and if it is our Duty 'to forgive without a Satisfaction received, and that God is to forgive us, as 'we forgive them, then is a Satisfaction *Totally excluded.* I confeſs I was ſurprized with this word, *Totally excluded.* Satisfaction is not the ſtrict Solution of a Debt in all Reſpects and Circumſtances. When we conſider the Dignity of our Lord, that was both God and Man; his Sufferings, (ſuppoſe they were not the Thouſand Part of what the Damned ſuffer) yet it was a true Satisfaction: Therefore I was ſcandalized with theſe words. An Hundred Years ago the Church of *England* has very well anſwered this fallacious Argument of *W. Penn*'s, that is, the ſame with the *Socinians*, in her Homily on Salvation, the Firſt Part.

And here he gives Nine Arguments to prove that the Notion of Chriſt's Satisfaction for Sin brings with it Nine irrational Conſequences and Irreligious: But they are ſo weak and inſignificant, that it were but loſs of time, to mention them here, or anſwer them. Only give me leave to add, Theſe very Perſons, *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*, after they have thruſt out of Doors by their falſe Logick, Chriſt's Satisfaction without us; they own that Chriſt in us (*a*) offereth up himſelf a Sacrifice, to appeaſe the wrath of God. Now, if free forgiveneſs exclude the Satisfaction of Chriſt without us, by *W. Penn*'s Argument, by the ſame it does as much exclude his Satisfaction within us; pray mark that.

(*a*) *See* W. Penn's *Rejoynder*, pag. 284. *And* G. W. *Light and Life*, p. 44.

Now you have heard a Proof from *W. Penn*, let me come to *Geo. Whitehead* again. You ſhall have here a rare Diſh of Divinity, not that I would provoke any to Lightneſs. But I have read many Books in my time, but I never read ſuch a Book (except the Ranters) in my Life; Popery is Orthodoxy to it. No Popiſh Prieſt will Argue as he has done, *G. Woitehead*'s *Light and Life*, pag. 8. He blames here *W. Burnet*, for ſaying, The Blood ſhed upon the Croſs ſprinkles the Conſcience, Sanctifies, Juſtifies, Redeems us. Now here is *G. Woitehead*'s Cenſure of him. 'Obſerve here a two-fold ſtreſs is laid upon that 'Blood; 1. Merit, to Salvation; 2. Work, to Sanctification: And ſo he hath 'ſet it up above God, for God could not ſave, he ſaith.

Obſerv. *To ſay, That Chriſt's Blood merits Salvation, is to ſet it up above God; for God could not ſave, he ſaith.*

Now, he wrongs *W. Burnet*: I know not the Man, his words are theſe, which ſome where or other I have noted. *W. Burnet* ſays, Chriſt as God, without being Man, he could not ſave. (*b*) But I wholly wave that Diſpute; I think it is above man's Capacity, whether Antecedently to God's purpoſe, he could have ſaved us without the Death of his own dear Son. But God having ſo ordained it, conſequentially to his purpoſe, it may be as ſafely and truly ſaid, as when the Scripture ſaith, God cannot lye. Is it any Reflection to ſay, God cannot lye, and that he cannot contradict his purpoſe? And the Scripture ſays, God has not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain Salvation by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; I hope then he cannot ſave us without the Man Chriſt, becauſe he has ſaid, he will not; and the Man Chriſt is a Joynt-Saviour with God the Father. Again, *pag.* 38. G. *W.* brings the words of *W. Burnet* thus.

(*b*) *See his Book*, pag. 35. *called*, *The Capital Principles.*

Bapt. 'Now the Quakers would be ſo far from directing Men to go to the 'Material Temple at *Jeruſalem*, that they make it but a vain thing to look to

'*Jeruſalem*, to the Antitype of that Temple, *viz.* to Jeſus Chriſt, as he was 'there crucified; or to that Blood, that was there ſhed for Juſtification, *p.* 24. Now ſee the Anſwer, 'The Quakers ſee no need of directing Men to the Type 'for the Antitype, neither to the outward Temple, nor yet to *Jeruſalem*, 'either to Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood, knowing that neither the Righteouſneſs 'of Faith, nor the word of it doth ſo direct, *Rom.* 10. And is it the Baptiſts Doctrine to direct Men to the Material Temple, and *Jeruſalem*, the Type 'for the Antitype? What (*c*) Nonſenſe and Darkneſs is this? And where 'do the Scriptures ſay, the Blood was there ſhed for Juſtification, and that 'Men muſt be directed to *Jeruſalem* to it?

It may be queſtioned whether there may not be ſome need to expound the Types, as directing to Chriſt, though not to practice them. But let that paſs. Now he ſays, it is contrary to *Rom.* 10. to direct People to Jeſus Chriſt as he was crucified at *Jeruſalem*. But let the Bible be Judge. He has not cited the Verſe, but the Verſes he aims at I ſhall read; *Ver.* 5, 6, 7, 8. *For* Moſes *deſcribeth the Righteouſneſs which is of the Law, that the man which doeth thoſe things, ſhall live by them*, &c. See Verſes 6, 7, 8.

Now, in their Preachments they have uſed to ſtop there, and go no further. But read the 9th. Verſe, *If thou ſhalt confeſs with thy mouth the Lord Jeſus, and ſhalt believe in thine heart, that God hath raiſed him from the dead, thou ſhalt be ſaved.* And where was it that God raiſed Chriſt from the Dead? Was it not at *Jeruſalem*? And there he died, where he roſe. And Chriſt, when he took the Cup, ſaid, *Drink ye all of it, this is the New Teſtament in my Blood, ſhed for many for the remiſſion of ſins.* And I believe he meant his Blood ſhed, was the outward Blood of his Body.

Stranger. Read the words again. Which *G. Keith did.*

G. Keith. You ſee *G. Whitehead* has falſified the Scriptures, and made them to ſay what they ſay not; as if to direct to Jeſus Chriſt as he was crucified at *Jeruſalem*, and to his Blood that was there ſhed, were contrary to *Rom.* 10. whereas it is plainly according to *Rom.* 10. 9, 10.

Quaker. It may be, ſomething following may explain it; read on. Which *G. Keith* did.

Light and Life, pag. 39. '(Whereas that Blood ſhed is not in being *pag.* 40) 'But the true Apoſtle directed them to the Light (which is ſo much oppoſed by 'the Baptiſts) to walk in the Light, for the Blood of Jeſus to cleanſe them from 'all ſin, 1 *John* 1. *And he died for our ſins, but roſe again for our juſtification*; 'which Reſurrection ſurely was after the ſhedding the blood outwardly.

G. Keith. Neither *W. Burnet*, nor no Baptiſt, place the all and whole of our Juſtification on Chriſt's outward Sufferings, and ſhedding his blood. For I ſay with them, and all Chriſtendom, That if Chriſt had died, and not riſen again, he could not have been an Atonement for our ſins: Therefore both his Death

---

(*c*) It is no more Nonſenſe than many good Chriſtian Teachers have uſed, to expound and open the Types of the Old Teſtament, and to ſhew how they directed to Chriſt, the Antitype; yea, divers Quakers Preach the Types as directing to Chriſt and his Spirit within: And *G. Fox* uſed much to Preach upon the Types of the Old Teſtament, as the Booths they made at the Feaſt of Tabernacles, and the Lamps in the Temple, and the Snuffers, how they had a Spiritual ſignification. And ſhall any Chriſtian ſay, that none of theſe Types ſignified Chriſt without, but only Chriſt within?

and

and Reſurrection are concerned in our Juſtification. Give me leave to tell you one Paſſage. *Tho. Ellwood* thinks to put a trick on the Reader, and ſays, it is wrong Printed, and that it ſhould have been *for*, inſtead of *to*; and he charges ſome Typographical Errors in my Books on me. He ſays, it was corrected in his Copy with a Pen; but he does not ſay, *G. Whitehead* mended it. He ſays, it ſhould be thus read, *Esther for Jeſus Chriſt, or his Blood.* He thinks that will ſo turn it, that it mends the matter, but it mends it nothing at all. And *G. Whitehead* has it, to, to, to, ſeveral times, (See *pag.* 38, 39. 'Where 'do the Scriptures ſay, ſaith *G. W.*) the blood was *there* ſhed for Juſtification, 'and that Men muſt be directed to *Jeruſalem to it?* Again, in *pag.* 61. *Light and Life*, he ſaith, 'Another while People muſt ſeek their Saviour above the 'Clouds and Firmament, contrary to the Righteouſneſs of Faith, *Rom.* 10. 6. 'Another while they muſt look to *Jeruſalem* for Juſtification *to the* blood that 'was there ſhed, contrary to *Deut.* 30. 13, 14. and *Rom.* 10. Is not this abominable Perverſion of Scripture, to confirm his Antichriſtian Doctrine?

Light and Life, pag. 61. 'What Confuſion what a Labyrinth and Uncertainty 'is he in, and does he bring his Hearers into (ſaith *G. Whitehead* of *Will. Burnet*) becauſe, according to Scripture, he aſſerts, that Men muſt be directed to Chriſt for Juſtification and Salvation, both as he ſuffered at *Jeruſalem*, and as he roſe again, and is aſcended into Heaven, above the Clouds and Firmament.

Next, you ſhall hear *Solomon Eccles*'s Letter, That the blood of Chriſt is no more than the blood of another Saint.

Quaker N. M. I beg a Favour. Here are ſeveral things urged as falſe Doctrine, which refer to ſeveral places of Scripture, which Scriptures ought alſo to be read.

G. Keith. They have been read, except *Deut.* 30. *Rom.* 10. is a repetition of *Deut.* 30. This is only to prolong time, and hinder me to proceed in my Proofs. But if the Auditory pleaſe, I will read both *Deut.* 30. and *Rom.* 10.

Auditory. There is no need, go on, and read *Solomon Eccles*'s Letter.

G. Keith. Before I read the Letter, let me read theſe Lines, in *G. Whitehead* his *Light and Life*, pag. 8. '*W. B.* (ſaith he) tells of looking to *Jeruſalem*, to 'Jeſus Chriſt, as he was there crucified, or to that blood that was there ſhed for 'Juſtification, Contradiction. That Chriſt, that reſtoreth man's loſs, is both 'to be ſought and found in Heaven, &c. but *in contradiction to both*, the Re-'ception of the Spirit the only means, the gift of Chriſt to us, and his being 'revealed in us by his Spirit. Here you ſee *G. Whitehead* makes it a Contradiction, that we muſt look to Chriſt as he died at *Jeruſalem*, and as he is now in Heaven. Judge ye if this be a Contradiction; but in Contradiction to both, he ſaith, it is a Contradiction to direct to Chriſt our Saviour, as he died at *Jeruſalem*; and that Chriſt that ſaveth us, is revealed within us by his Spirit. Now the Letter, which G. *Whitehead* does own, it is a Letter of *Solomon Eccles*, it is this:

Robert Porter.

TAKE heed of belying the Innocent; for I hear that thou hast reported to a Friend of mine, that I should say, That the Blood of Christ is no more than the Blood of another Man. I never spake it, but do very highly esteem of the Blood of Christ, to be more Excellent, and Living, and Holy, and Precious than is able to be uttered by the Tongues of Men and Angels: I mean the Blood which was offered up in the Eternal Spirit, Heb. 9. 14. *But the Blood that was forced out of him by the Soldiers, after he was dead, who before that, bowed his Head to the Father, and gave up the Ghost; but thou sayest, that was the Blood of the New-Covenant, which was shed after he was dead, which I do deny; yet I did say, That was no more than the Blood of another Saint. These were my Words, which thou art wresting to thy own Destruction. And for the other Lye that thou chargest me withal, that I should say, That the Blood of Christ should fall to the Ground within a twelfth Month, it is false, and never was spoke by me: But I did say, That the* Baptists, *and* Independants, *and* Presbyterians, *and* Pope, *are all of one Ground, and none of you understand the Blood of Jesus Christ no more than a brute Beast; therefore repent, for God will suddenly overthrow your Faith, and your imputative Righteousness too, for the Imputation of Christ's Righteousness which he did at* Jerusalem, *and without the Gates, the* Pope, *the* Episcopal, *the* Presbyterian, Independants *and* Baptists, *shall have all alike, and shall sit down in Sorrow, short of the Eternal Rest: But the true imputative Righteousness of Christ we own; but it is hid from you all, till the Lord do open an Eye within you.*

Stranger. Who Printed that Letter?

G. Keith. W. Burnet, the Baptist Preacher.

Have you any Testimony of their owning that Letter?

T. Slaughter. I can answer to the Letter.

G. Keith. It may be thou art the Man.

T. Slaughter. I am not the Man, but I have had a Copy of the Letter. It was writ to one *Foster* at *Wheatstone*, and the Letter is true.

Auditors. Pray, Sir, where do you live, and what is your Name?

T. Slaughter. My Name is *Thomas Slaughter*, I live at *Darking*, I have a Son that is a Tallow Chandler that lives in *Bow-Lane*, where you may have an Account of me.

G. Keith. George Whitehead doth not question the Letter to be true, but defends it, and as much opposeth Justification by the outward or material Blood of Christ, as *Solomon Eccles* doth. Here is a weighty Passage, *George Whitehead* says in his Book, *Light and Life*, which *T. Ellwood* transcribes and vindicates, *T. Ellwood* represents *G. Whitehead*. And this is one of the Books, they say (in their printed Paper they have sent and read at this Meeting) I have not answered. And this is *G. Whitehead* in Effigie. I had charged *G. Whitehead* for saying, That Christ's material Blood, shed at *Jerusalem*, was but a Type of the Blood we were justified by. *T. Ellwood* finds fault with me for this. And you shall see *T. Ellwood*'s Vindication, and how far *G. Whitehead* has owned or disowned *S. Eccles*'s Letter. 'All things under the Law, (says

'*W. Burnet*)

'*W. Burnet*) in the Type, was purged with Blood, and this Blood was ma-
'terial Blood and not myſtical; and that Blood that Chriſt ſhed in order to
'the effecting the Salvation of Man, muſt needs be viſible and material
'Blood.

Theſe are *W. Burnet*'s Words. Now *G. Whitehead* ſays,

Baptiſt. All things under the Law, in the Type was purged with Blood, and this Blood was material Blood, and not myſtical, and that Blood that Chriſt ſhed, in order to the effecting the Salvation of Man, muſt needs be material and viſible Blood.

Anſw. 'Do but mark here what a ſad Conſequence he has drawn, as if one
'ſhould Reaſon, that becauſe the Type was material, viſible, and not myſti-
'cal, therefore the Antitype or Subſtance muſt needs be material, and not
'myſtical. By this all Myſteries or Divine things are excluded from being
'either Spiritual, Antitype, or Subſtance; whereas it was the Heavenly
'things themſelves, that are in Chriſt, in which conſiſts the Subſtance and
'End of Types and Shadows. But to ſay, that material Blood was a Type
'of that which was material, this is to give the Subſtance no Preheminence
'above the Type (eſpecially if neither of them be myſtical nor in being)
'or like as if one ſhould ſay, one Type was a Type of another. Whereas
'both the Heavenly, and more perfect Tabernacle and Altar, with the Hea-
'venly things, are all a Myſtery, and Spiritual, the Offering and Living Sa-
'crifices are Spiritual, the Paſſover Spiritual, the Seed Spiritual, the Bread,
'the Fruit of the Vine Spiritual, the Oyl, the Fleſh, and the Blood, which
'give Life to the Soul, yea, the Water and Blood, which waſheth and ſprink-
'leth the Conſcience, are all Spiritual and Myſterious, as the New Covenant
'it ſelf is, which they belong to, and theſe things known in. And this is
'the new and living way, which Chriſt ſet open, through the Veil of his
'Fleſh, *Heb.* 10. Let them receive this who can.

Note, By *G. Whitehead*'s Argument, as the New Covenant is Spiritual and inward, and not outward, ſo the Blood of the New Covenant is inward and not outward; ſo the Paſſover is inward, which is Chriſt the Mediator, and not outward; this is a plain denyal of the Man Chriſt without us to be our Mediator, our Paſſover, Offering, or his Fleſh and Blood without us to be concerned in our Salvation otherwiſe than as the Type. That Chriſt's Fleſh is called the Veil, is not to be underſtood like the Typical Veils, Figures, and Shadows, but hath a far greater and profound ſenſe and conſideration.

But mark, *W. Burnet* does not expreſs it univerſally, but in this particular Caſe: And *G. Whitehead* extends it to an Univerſal; as if all the Types of the Old Teſtament ſignified nothing Internally and Spiritually. But *W. Burnet* ſaith no ſuch thing, though he juſtly contends that the material Blood of the Beaſts that were offered, was a Type of the material Blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed; yet many of the Types ſignified the internal and ſpiritual Gifts and Graces that true Believers have by Chriſt.

Now here I clinch the matter: *G. Whitehead* ſays, But to ſay material Blood was a Type of that which was material; this is to give the Subſtance no pre-eminence above the Type (eſpecially if neither of them be myſtical, nor in being) or like as if one ſhould ſay, one Type was a Type of another. Now the Argument lies here; If the Sacrifices under the Law were Types of Chriſt's Blood then that Blood muſt not be outward Blood, but inward, to wit, the Light and Life in Men; but this is a falſe Conſequence of *G. Whitehead*, and ſheweth, that he denieth Remiſſion of Sin, and Juſtification by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed. And this whole Paſſage of *G. Whitehead*, his Advocate

T. Ellwood.

T. Ellwood doth defend in his Book called *Truth Defended*, which is one of the two they ſay I have not anſwered.

Now as to the Letter, we go on to what *T. Elwood* ſays, He is ſo unfair, he will have it, that *G. Whitehead* owns, that the material Blood of Chriſt is that by which we are juſtified. But here is the Trick, *G. Whitehead* makes a typical Offering of Chriſt, and an anti-typical; the typical was the Offering of Chriſt at *Jeruſalem*, the anti-typical is the Offering of Chriſt within. See here then their Anſwer: It was queried, whether they owned that we are by the Blood of Chriſt outwardly ſhed, juſtified; or that the Blood that was outwardly ſhed, did belong to the Sacrifice? *G. Whitehead* has ſince of late anſwered: Yea, here they have ſought to blind all the World; Chriſt, as he outwardly ſuffered was a Sacrifice, but a typical Sacrifice. Therefore the next Queſtion to be put, muſt be, Whether he was the anti-typical Sacrifice?

Now ſee what *G. Whitehead* hath ſaid to the Letter of *Solomon Eccles*, to blame or cenſure it. I can find nothing at all. He does not own that *Solomon Eccles*'s Expreſſion was an Article of their Faith, but does he diſown it? Nay, a man may not own a thing to be an Article of his Faith, and yet not diſown it. If *G. Whitehead* had had the true Faith in Chriſt crucified, and had the true Value of Chriſt's Blood, outwardly ſhed, he would have very ſeverely and ſharply blamed and cenſured *Solomon Eccles*'s Letter as blaſphemous, but I find not that he cenſured it all. He tells you in what Sence he owns it, *viz.* That Blood had a peculiar Significat on; I told him, ſo had the Blood of Beaſts a peculiar Signification, for their Blood ſignified Remiſſion of Sin, but was no ſatisfactory Offering for Sin: And if Chriſt's Blood outwardly ſhed was a Type, as *G. Whitehead* affirms it was, then he confirms *Solomon Eccles*'s falſe Doctrine, and makes it no more than the Blood of the Beaſts that were offered.

But ſaith *T. Ellwood*, He does own that the Blood of Chriſt is more than the Blood of another Saint; but what Blood? the Blood of Chriſt within, there is the Trick. Is not this enough to cheat all the World? They have a double Meaning as (*d*) *Arius* had. They ſay they own the Blood of Chriſt, and every other thing ſaid of him according to the Scripture; ſo ſaid the *Arians* and *Macedonians*, when at other times they diſcovered their Meaning to be quite contrary to Scripture.

(d) *See for this in the Church-Hiſtory of* Socrates Scholaſticus, lib. 2. c. 7. *and* c. 25.

Quaker. N. M. I offer a Word in Vindication, which is this: I am here an accidental Man, as you are. What I would offer is this. 1. I acknowledge the Favour you give me leave to ſpeak. Next, this little Tumult gives me Occaſion to let you know that the principal Reaſon of the Perſons not being here, that were challenged, was that Confuſion and Diſorder that would be the Conſequence.

G. Keith. Who makes it?

Quaker. N. M. There are not fifteen of us here, (*e*) therefore we take care

---

(e) Note, *The Meeting was for moſt part orderly and attentive; if any little Diſorder happened, it was by occaſion of* W. Pen's *Party, and particularly by* Henry Goldney *that threw printed Papers among the People, in the Meeting, on purpoſe to make a Diſturbance; but what Diſturbance happened, it was ſoon ended by the Care and Diligence of the Marſhal, ſent by the Lord Mayor, to prevent any Diſorders.*

not

not to be parties to it. The Perſons challenged I do reſpect; I know their own Ability, I think my ſelf not capable to ſpeak in their behalf. What I wou'd ſay, is to the Letter. The Letter you are to underſtand, is the Effect of a Diſpute between two Perſons. Though this Letter was writ by one that had Converſation with us, yet I think we are not intitled to what is in it. But if *G. Whitehead* hath writ in Vindication of it, it affects us as a People: And whatever we publiſh as a People, we are ſo far affected with it. But this Letter was writ by the Hand of a particular Man, whoſe Converſation among us I think not fit to anſwer for.

G. Keith. He was an Eminent Preacher among them.

Quaker. He ſays, *G. Whitehead* has vindicated this Letter; now I obſerve *G. Whitehead* finds fault with the Letter.

G. Keith. Here he makes *G. Whitehead* the Repreſentative and Metropolitan of the Quakers, ſaying, what *G. W.* writes, affects them as a People. I am a Quaker ſtill, though I glory not in any Name, but that I may be accounted a true Chriſtian. But he ſays, if *G. Whitehead* has juſtified the Letter, it is imputable to the Body. What is this, but to make *G. Whitehead* the Metropolitan? And I proteſt againſt it. I have ſo much Charity and Knowledge of many of the Quakers, that I believe there are Thouſands will not own that Letter, though *G. Whitehead* does. He ſays, if *G. Whitehead* juſtifies that Letter, the whole Body is underſtood to juſtifie it. Now, I ſee not one Syllable wherein *G. Whitehead* blames it: And he that does not teſtifie againſt a thing, when he has juſt occaſion for it, juſtifies it. But hear what *G. Whitehead* ſaith, *pag.* 58. *Light and Life.* Now, to theſe words, *viz. No more than the Blood of another Saint, his intent was,* ſaith *G. Whitehead, as to Papiſts and you, whoſe minds are carnal,* &c. This never was my Quakeriſm. For my belief all along, was, that Papiſts, and Baptiſts, and all, have a Benefit by Chriſt's Death. Now it is come to this, *That the Blood of Chriſt is no more to Papiſts and Baptiſts, than the Blood of another Saint.*

His next Defence of *S. Eccles*'s Letter is, *That it was no more ſimply as to the matter of Blood.* Then they may [with Reverence be it ſpoken] as it was reported ſome have ſaid, ſay, it is no more than the Blood of a Thief, ſimply as to the matter of Blood; but it may be affirmed, that ſimply conſidered, it was more than the Blood of any Saint; for as it was never defiled with ſin, ſo his Body of Fleſh and Blood had a Miraculous Conception above all other Men, though it had the true Nature of our Fleſh and Blood, yet it had an Excellency above that of all other Men.

But let us conſider theſe words of *S. E.* which *G. W.* ſaith, might ſatisfie any Spiritual or unbyaſſed Mind, *I do very highly eſteem of the Blood of Chriſt, to be more Excellent,* &c. Here is *Solomon Eccles*'s Fallacy, and *George Whitehead*'s Fallacy alſo.

Now you know what Blood they mean, and ſee what Blood *G. Whitehead* means; The Blood is Spiritual and Inward, the other is a Type. 'It is 'confeſſed, ſaith *G. W. Light and Life,* pag. 56. That God by his own Blood pur-'chaſed to himſelf a Church, *Acts.* 20. 28. Now the Blood of God (ſaith he) 'or that Blood that relates to God, muſt needs be Spiritual, he being a Spirit; 'and the Covenant of God is Inward and Spiritual, and ſo is the Blood of it. So you ſee he doth not allow the Blood outwardly ſhed to relate to God, or to be the Blood of the New Covenant, or that God purchaſed his Church with that Blood outwardly ſhed on the Croſs. Is not this a plain Juſtification of *Solomon Eccles*'s Letter, *That that Blood is no more than that of another Saint?* judge ye, who are Intelligent.

Again,

Again, He judges none of them guilty of Blaſphemy therein, as he ſaith *pag.* 58. *Light and Life. viz.* Neither *Solomon Eccles*, nor *W. Burnet*. But wherein does he charge him? I find not in any thing.

I cannot produce and read to you many of my Proofs for want of time, but two or three to every following Head.

You have had an Account of them as to Juſtification. Now it is worth your while to ſee how theſe [pretended] Infallible Men contradict one another. *W. Penn*, (*Reaſon againſt Railing*) falls in with *T. Danſon*, and Argues like a Chriſtian, though in Contradiction to himſelf elſewhere, That no Obedience that Man can perform to God, by the help of the Spirit is ſtrictly Meritorious, according to the Law of God. This is good Doctrine, and ſo is the Reaſon too, becauſe it is but finite; and I would make uſe of the ſame Argument. But *G. Whitehead*, in Anſwering this Argument, Anſwers *T. Danſon* thus: Whereas *T. Danſon* Argues, That the Obedience and Righteouſneſs, wrought in the Saints by the Spirit, is but finite, and therefore not Meritorious. *G. Whitehead* denies this, that it is finite, and ſaith, it is infinite. So that by his Argument, our Obedience and Righteouſneſs that God works in us, is equal to God himſelf. Now I will read the Paſſage. *W. Penn*'s Reaſon againſt Railing, *Pag.* 82. *Rewardableneſs is a work without which God will not beſtow his Favour, and yet not the meritorious Cauſe, for that there is no proportion betwixt the work that is finite and temporary, and the Reward which is infinite and eternal, in which ſenſe both the Creature obeys the Commands of God, and does not merit, but obtain only; and God rewards the Creature, and yet ſo, that he freely gives too.* A good Proteſtant Argument, and good Proteſtant Doctrine, ſo far; but that he contradicts it again, by oppoſing the neceſſity of Faith in Chriſt crucified for Juſtification, and totally excluding Chriſt's Satisfaction, in order to Juſtification and Remiſſion of ſin.

You ſee *W. Penn* ſays, the Work is finite and temporary, and therefore does not ſtrictly Merit. But hear *G. Whitehead*, in his Book, called, *The Voice of Wiſdom againſt Antichriſt*, &c. *pag.* 36. Printed at *London*, *Anno* 1659. (*f*) *The Righteouſneſs which God effects in us, is not finite, but infinite; for Chriſt is God's Righteouſneſs, and Chriſt is formed in us*, Gal. 4. 19. *And ſo that Righteouſneſs which God works in us by his Spirit, is of the ſame Kind and Nature with that which worketh it, for the Saints are made partakers of the* (*g*) *Divine Nature*, 2 Pet. 1. 4. Now, if you think I have read wrong, read it your ſelves.

Quaker. I do not think ſo, only I think the whole Paragraph ſhould be read. I hope you have all ſo much Chriſtianity, as rather to hope, that what *G. Keith* has pretended to be a Proof, that he cannot prove it, than that he can: For it were well, if there were no Party of People that there could be any Proof againſt.

G. Keith. I wiſh I had no occaſion to produce any Proofs of this kind.

Quaker. To pick here and there a piece, out of two or three Books, it is impracticable.

(*f*) Note here two Gods of one Kind and Nature, by his abſurd Logick and falſe Philoſophy; one that worketh, another that is wrought. Oh groſs Darkneſs and Ignorance in *G. Whitehead!*

(*g*) The Saints are partakers of the Divine Nature, and ſo are they of the Holy Ghoſt; is therefore the Holy Ghoſt a Work or Effect wrought in us? This is to confound the Creator with the Creature, and is a Divinity more fit for *Bedlam* than any ſober Society of People. *G. Keith.*

G. Keith. They ſhould have been here then to have defended it. I will read the whole Paragraph to you.

Now I would haſte to a Concluſion. I have proved to you, that they have excluded the Blood of Chriſt, that we are not juſtified by the Blood outwardly ſhed. I come to prove that they ſay, we are not ſanctified by that Blood. I ſhall read to you, *G. Whitehead, pag.* 49, 50, 51. Here is one Proof, if ye think this is not enough, I will bring more. Neither did I ever read, ſays the Baptiſt, that it was the Blood or Life of Chriſt in his People that we are juſtified by.

Now here is *G. Whitehead*'s Anſwer, *Light and Life, pag.* 59. 'The Spirit of 'Chriſt (which is Life) doth both Quicken, Sanctifie, and Juſtifie the true 'Believers, *John* 6. 63. 1 *Cor.* 6. And that Blood and Water that's ſaid to 'cleanſe, is not of another kind, but agrees in one with the Spirit, all which 'is known within, and the Effects thereof.

So you ſee he takes it away from the outward Blood, and gives it to the inward Blood.

Auditors. Go to the next Head.

G. Keith. That is but *G. Whitehead*'s Proof, I ſhall give you *W. Penn*'s Proof.

Auditors. Let us hear it.

G. Keith. I would be loath to mention this Man, *Iſ. Pennington.* However this Queſtion is in his Book, and I charitably think this Paſſage dropt from him unawares: I wiſh I could have that ground of Charity to others of them. But Truth ought to be more Precious to me, than any Man. I only mention his Name as to the Subject we are on. *Jo. Faldo* thinks that he has made *Iſ. Pennington* his own. Can outward Blood waſh the Conſcience? *p.* 29. A plain Denial, ſays *Jo. Faldo.* Here is *Jo. Faldo*'s Commentary on *Iſ. Pennington*'s words. Now ſee how *W. Penn* explains *Iſ. Pennington*'s words, *pag.* 149. *Is he ſo impiouſly unjuſt, that becauſe we do deny, that outward Blood can be brought into the Conſcience, to perform that inward work (which they themſelves dare not, nay, do not hold) therefore* Iſaac Pennington *denies any Efficacy to be in that outward Offering and Blood towards Juſtification, as it reſpects meer Remiſſion of former Sins and Iniquities.* So in ſhort, I take it thus: W. *Penn* Anſwers, That *Iſ. Pennington*'s words are to be underſtood with reference to Sanctification, but not Juſtification. Says he, Outward Blood cannot be brought into the Conſcience to perform that work: But the way that Blood has been brought into my Conſcience, is by the application of a living Faith in Chriſt, whoſe Blood it was, the Spirit of God working that Faith in me; and that Blood is not a Phyſical, but a Moral cauſe of our cleanſing. 1 Chriſt Jeſus, by his Obedience and Suffering, procured the Pardon of my Sins, as well as he ſealed it by his Blood. And, 2. He procured the Spirit to Sanctifie me. Therefore I agree with all true Chriſtians herein.

I find none ſay, there muſt be a material application of that Blood, but a Spiritual and Moral; and we can give Inſtances that Moral Cauſes are many times more effectual Cauſes than Phyſical are: As the Money wherewithal we buy the Medicine that cures the Body, is not the Phyſical cauſe of Health, but a Moral; and the Money that we buy Bread with, is not the Phyſical cauſe of our Nouriſhment and Refreſhment, but a Moral; and yet it is ſo great a cauſe, that without Money, neither Bread nor Medicine can be readily obtained, and not at all without ſomewhat equivalent.

Now I have done with the two firſt Heads, ſhall I go on to prove the other two, or ſhall we adjourn to another day?

Auditors. If half an hour will do, go on.

G. Keith. I know not but it will, but that they oft interrupt us with Digreſſions.

The Third Head to be proved, i', That the Body that dieth, riſeth not again. Firſt, from *W. Penn*'s holding the Reſurrection immediately after Death, in his Rejoynder, *pag.* 138. I think this will be enough for *W. Penn*, if I give no more. *T. Hicks* Argues thus for the Reſurrection of the Body; That if there be no Reſurrection of the Body, the Joys of Heaven ſhould elſe be imperfect. Now here is *VV. Penn*'s Anſwer to it. 'I Anſwer, 'Is the Joy of the Ancients now in Glory imperfect? Or are they in 'Heaven but by halves? If it be ſo unequitable, that the Body which hath 'ſuffered, ſhould not partake of the Joys Cœleſtial, is it not in meaſure un-'equal, that the Soul ſhould be rewarded ſo long before the Body? This Prin-'ciple brings to the Mortality of the Soul (held by many Baptiſts) or I am 'miſtaken. But why muſt the Felicity of the Soul depend upon that of the 'Body? Is it not to make the Soul a kind of Widow, and ſo in a ſtate of 'Mourning and Diſconſolateneſs, to be without its beloved Body? Which ſtate 'is but a better ſort of Purgatory. *G. VVhitehead* Argues the ſame way: 'If 'the deceaſed Saints in Heaven, or their Souls, have not all that they expect 'to all Eternity, all the Reſurrection they look for, then they muſt be in Pur-'gatory for the time: But if the latter be not, then not the former. But this contradicts many Scriptures, that eſpecially in *Acts* 26. *That Chriſt ſhould ſuffer, and ſhould be the firſt that ſhould riſe from the dead.* Now, according to this Doctrine of *VV. Penn*, and *G. VVhitehead*, Chriſt's Reſurrection was later than that of many Millions.

Now, if you will hear a Proof from *G. VVhitehead*, you may.

Auditors. Yes, let us hear it.

G. Keith. Here is the place, *pag.* 353. G. Whitehead's *Chriſtian Quaker*. Says *T. Danſon*, 'The Happineſs of the Soul is not perfect without the Body, its 'dear and beloved Companion, the Soul having a ſtrong deſire and inclina-'tion to a re-union to the Body, as the Schools not without ground deter-'mine. *Vide* Calv.

And here is *G. VVhitehead*'s Anſwer, *pag.* 353. 'Both *Calvin*, *T. Danſon*, the 'the Schools, and divers Anabaptiſts, are miſtaken in this very matter, and 'ſee not with the Eye of true Faith, either that the Happineſs of the Soul 'is not perfect without the Body, or that the Soul hath a ſtrong deſire to a 're-union to the Body, while they intend the Terreſtrial Elementary Bodies, 'for this implies the Soul to be in a kind of Purgatory or Diſquietneſs, till the 'ſuppoſed reſumption of the Body. You ſee I hope here is Proof enough, that *G. VV.* holds, that the deceaſed Saints look for no Reſurrection of the Body.

Quaker. Elementary Body, *G. VVhitehead* ſaith.

Quaker H. Goldney. He reads that word faintly.

G. Keith. What other Body could it be? The Matter is, there is the ſame Argument of *G. VVhitehead*, and *VV. Penn*. A little Philoſophy I hope will not offend you; I hope if they make uſe of falſe Philoſophy to defend their falſe Faith, I may make uſe of true Philoſophy to defend the true Faith. And the Objection they make is the ſame againſt Chriſt's Body. Pray, was not Chriſt's Body Elementary? Did he not eat and drink? And was it not the ſame as we eat and drink? And if we eat and drink of what are Elementary, then his Body did receive the ſame Elements, and they were converted into his Body. And *G. VVhitehead* owns in his later Writings, that Chriſt's Body

that

that roſe, is the ſame with his Body that ſuffered; but his Pride will not ſuffer him to own his former Error, either in that, or in other things. And ſeeing *VV. Penn* thinks it abſurd that a Body can be transformed from an Earthly and Animal Body to an Heavenly Body, as he Argueth, *Reaſ. againſt Rail.* p. 134. He makes it not only as groſs as Tranſubſtantiation, but worſe: But this is his groſs Ignorance in true Philoſophy, and his falſe Philoſophy deſtroys his Faith. It is not Tranſubſtantiation, if I ſay, a Saint's Body is the ſame at the Reſurrection for ſubſtance, as it was when it went into the Grave, leaving the Fæces, or droſſy part of it behind. But if he ſay, Chriſt hath not the ſame ſubſtance of Body that he had on the Earth, this is plain Tranſubſtantiation. For have not many that Underſtanding, that a groſs body of Herbs, or other Subſtance, can by Chymical Operation be made ſo Subtil, Volatile, and Spiritual (without any Tranſubſtantiation, or change of the Subſtance) that a Glaſs can ſcarce confine it, or hold it. Now, *VV. Penn* holds, that groſsneſs is ſo Eſſential to a Body, that a Body muſt ceaſe to be a bodily Subſtance, if it put off Groſsneſs or Carniety, and that Carniety is Eſſential to a Carnal Body. But ſee how contrary this is to common Senſe and Underſtanding. There is no Woman that ſets a Hen to breed Chickens, but knows the contrary; you know the Subſtance of the Egg (the White and Yolk) by the force and heat of the Hen ſitting on the Egg, is changed into a Chicken (*b*). Is here any Tranſubſtantiation? So that W. *Penn* and G. *Whitehead* are guilty of the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation, and not we, and abuſe the World with falſe Philoſophy. They warn People againſt *G. Keith*, and his falſe Philoſophy; and I appeal to you to Judge, whether they have not abuſed the People with falſe and vain Philoſophy.

(b) *And in* Egypt *we hear that Chickens are bred of Eggs ſimply by heat, without the Hen.*

Auditors. If you will anſwer one of theſe two things, you that are a Friend of *W. Penn*, do; you have excommunicated *G. Keith*, either anſwer, or juſtifie it.

G. Keith. If they will appoint a Meeting of Friends, to prove me guilty of Error, I will never refuſe to meet them; and here are many Perſons of diſcretion. I thank God, that has given me that humble Heart, that if they bring any Paſſage out of my Books that is not to be juſtified, I will own my Error and ſhortneſs. Now, if they would do the like, it would be well. But the matter is here, *T. Danſon* ſays, Our want of Infallibility is no Argument againſt our Miniſtry. *G. Whitehead* ſays, it is; they that want Infallibility are not true Miniſters. Now, I hope I have proved they want Infallibility, and therefore by their own Doctrine, they are no true Miniſters of Chriſt. Therefore I think it neceſſary to have the Paſſage read. *G. Whitehead*'s Voice of Wiſdom, *pag.* 33. Says *T. Danſon*, 'As for our want of Infallibility, 'tis no 'valid Plea againſt our Miniſtry, *&c.* Now here is the Anſwer. 'His fal-'ſhood here appears plainly, for they that want Infallibility (ſaith *G.W.*) and 'have not the Spirit of Chriſt, they are out of the Truth, and are fallible, 'and their Miniſtry is not of the Spirit, ſeeing they ſpeak not from the Spirit, 'but from their own Hearts, which are deceitful, when they want Infallibi-'lity.

Quaker, N. Marks. I do make my further Appeal to you, and if I am either impertinent or defective, I beg your Excuſe.

G. Keith. Then thou art not Infallible.

Quaker. You may be aſhamed to mention that. (i)

Quaker N. Marks. What I have to offer, I ſubmit to you. The Perſon that has denoted me to be *W. Penn*'s Friend, has hit right; and I own I am not capable to repreſent him. And as you are Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, I hope you will not conclude that Philoſophy or Logick are any Eſſentials to Chriſtianity.

G. *Keith.* Who ſays it is? But is it not ſad, that their falſe Philoſophy ſhould deſtroy their Faith, and deceive ſo many People, and deſtroy their Faith?

Quaker N. Marks. I hope you will obſerve too, that the Method taken to make the Proofs, has been principally by the Rules of Philoſophy and Logick. Next, I beg the Charity of you to conſider, how much it is the Right of every Man to give his own Interpretation of all he ſays and writes. Therefore I hope you will not believe all you hear, having the Illuſtrations of an Antagoniſt. Next, I would Apologize for the Perſons, they are not here; it may be you are not all of you capable of knowing the Reaſon of things. G. *Keith* has had his Converſation among us many Years, between Twenty and Thirty Years.

G. *Keith.* Between Thirty and Forty Years.

Quaker. N. Marks. Now for as much as theſe Writings were then extant long ago, and he was then intirely paſſive, ſtill, and quiet, under all; theſe Objections he now makes, I hope, as we know, ſo you will believe, it does not ariſe altogether from the matter of Fact: For I do not think this a good way of proving, to take a bit here and a bit there. Next I ſay, I hope you will reaſonably conclude, that we who knew the Circumſtances of his Life and his Temper, knew his Converſation has been ſuch that we could not own him. He ſtands not charg'd with us on the Account of his Principles. I do not know but you will find, when you have an Anſwer to what he has offered, that thoſe he charges and paraphraſes on, will agree with him in Principles; nor have we any thing againſt his Converſation among Men in the World. It was his Diſcontents with particular Perſons, becauſe he was a little troubleſome petulant Man and we could not pacifie him; and it was for that Reaſon chiefly that we did diſown him.

G. *Keith.* A little petulant Man.

Quaker. I would have you note, I do not pretend to perſonate any of the Perſons challenged.

Auditors. What is this Diſcourſe for, then? They are aſhamed to come.

Quaker. I am coming to give you a further Reaſon why they do not meet him. We have had ſeveral Meetings with him before he was put from us. And the Reaſons why they did not think fit to meet him now, you have heard, the Paper gives you an Account of it. Now ſince he is diſowned by us, and alſo by them where he lives, we do not think our ſelves obliged to ſubmit to ſuch a peremptory Challenge.

G. *Keith.* I ſuppoſe you cannot think I can anſwer to every particular becauſe my Memory does not ſerve me. He charges me to take a bit here

---

(i) N. Marks *doth not profeſs himſelf to be Infallible, being not of the Miniſtry: But whence is it, that the Laicks ſhould own themſelves Fallible, and the Miniſtry Infallible? But at laſt it is come to this, that ſome of the Miniſtry are Fallible alſo, but ſuch Principal Miniſters as* G. W. *are not.*

and

and a bit there out of their Books, I have quoted full Periods at length, as all Authors do, the Quakers when they refute Books of Adversaries, do not use to recite the whole Author they write against.

Stranger. About what you say as to Philosophy, Dr. *Sherlock* says, the Salvation of the Soul Depends not on such niceties; but for you to charge *G. Keith* as an Apostate, is one of the greatest Charges under Heaven; and now for you to say that he differs not from you in Principles, is to clear him from that Charge.

Upon which the People made some Shout.

G. Keith. Pray be quiet, and regard the Honour of your Nation. Let me put you in mind of one very great falshood. He says--Here one *Wyat*, or *Wait* a Quaker interrupted *G.* K. as they did oft, on purpose to divert him from his matter.

Quaker Wait. There is an Apostacy from the Spirit of Christianity, as well as from the Principles: Friends have excommunicated him, not for his Principles, but for going from the Spirit of Meekness, Charity, *&c.*

G. Keith. The Tree is known by the Fruits. I was like a Lamb among I know not what, where there were Two or Three Hundred. I had scarce One that sympathized with me, at their Yearly Meeting, when clandestinely with their Doors shut, suffering none that were my Friends, to be present, they passed false Judgment against me, without any Trial: A Notorious Falshood he chargeth against me, and nothing else: only he calls me a *little petulant man*; and he is not a Story above my height. He says, I am ———

Quaker. I observe a Contradiction in *G. Keith*; he said, he was not disowned by half the Yearly Meeting; and now he says by all.

G. Keith. Let me answer that. I say, Divers in the Meeting were favourable—— but *W. P.* and *G. W.* over-ruled them, and influenced them against me with Prejudice; and some they over-awed and frighted. There was a Person that came to me, and told me, he would rather suffer his Life to be taken from him, or his Right Hand to be cut off before he would sign a sentence against me. And some others that were not free to consent to them, did purposely absent and this I told them in their yearly Meeting; that there was such a person that had so spoke to me that day, they asked me who it was, I told them, I desired to be excused, in not telling his Name, that was not convenient.

After I was gone, they called over the Roll one by one; and the poor man seeing it coming to him, says, You need go no further, I am the Man; now what is this, but to set up something like the *Spanish* Inquisition? And there is one (*viz. T. E.*) hath applyed that passage in *Scripture*, *Master*, *is it I?* but the question there was, *Is it thou?* And tho I had cause to think that divers then present did not in Conscience consent to their false Judgment, but thought it too severe, as some has since acknowledged, yet I did not know, as to the last Meeting, that of all them that were present, that I had one that Sympathized with me; they were all silent, and were-over awed by *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn's* Party. And this poor man, above-mentioned, has come to me since, and disowned that false Judgment, and declared to me before two Witnesses, he did not joyn with them in it. He says I am disowned by them, where I live, I suppose he means the (*a*) *Scots*, do I Live among them? this is a notorious falshood.

Stranger. All this is very impertinent to the business in hand.

G. Keith. I happened to drop an Expression in *Pensilvania*, finding the same Errors there I have now mentioned in their Books here, that no Protestant Society would suffer such Errors as these, no not the Church of *Rome* it self; my words were, that no Protestant Society would Tolerate them. They began with me. There was an universal neglect among them of Preaching Christ Crucified, and concerning Faith in

(*a*) *To some in* Scotland, *being influenced with their false reports, have seemed to disown me, yet others have not, and some of them have writ kindly to me, and owned me.*

him; Preaching only the Light within, and Chriſt within. Whereupon, a little while after, I began to Preach this; and they ſtood up againſt me, and charged me with new Doctrine; and one (*a*) appealed to the Monthly Meeting, whether they ever heard of ſuch Doctrine Preached in the Quakers Meetings, directing them to Faith in Chriſt without us: I anſwered, The more ſhame, and it was now, full time to begin, if it was never Preached in the Quakers Meetings before. But that to witneſs againſt Error, and ſharply to reprove it, is no Argument of Apoſtacy. I have moſt effectual Proofs from the Quakers themſelves, *Ed. Burrough's* ſays, *It is no breach of the Peace to witneſs againſt Error*, Truths Princip. *G. Fox* ſays, *He was moved by the Lord to teſtifie againſt Falſe Teachers, that deceive the People with falſe Doctrine.* Now if they be guilty of theſe things, I ſay I am not to be blamed to withſtand their falſe Doctrine. They ſay I began firſt to Print, which is true; but they ſent out their defaming manuſcripts againſt me to *England*, *Barbadoes*, *Maryland*, before I Printed a line againſt them. What is the laſt Remedy againſt oppreſſion? Why, Printing. Therefore I began.

G. Fox. p. 15. Some of the Principles of the (*b*) Elect People of God, called Quakers. I hope this one Teſtimony of *G. Fox* will clear me, that I am not guilty of the breach of the Peace in the Church for oppoſing their Doctrines. Some Principles of the Elect People of God, ſigned by *G. Fox*. "Says *G. Fox*, *Moved of the Lord, written from the Spirit of the Lord, for the cleanſing of the Land of all falſe Teachers, Seducers and Deceivers and witches, who beguile the People, and Inchanters and Diviners, and Forgerers and Hirelings, and which is for the good of the People.*

Now was this man of a Turbulent Spirit? What work did *G. Fox* and *G. Whitehead* make? What breach upon breach did they make on all other Profeſſions whereof they had been formerly, as Church of *England*, Presbyterian, Baptiſts? Do not miſtake me, I Reverence Divine Providence that I became a Quaker. But if I had known they had had ſuch Errors among them, I would as ſoon have put my Head in the fire, as have owned ſuch among them: But I am of the ſame Faith as I have been above this thirty years.

Quaker. It has been here aſſerted, that he has been a Quaker above thirty years, and he has Vindicated their Doctrine; he is a Studious man, and our Books have been publick always; now for him to come now and call over all Books, that he has, by not oppoſing, conſented to, it looks as if he had Apoſtatized from what he formerly held.

Auditor. Did he ever write againſt theſe Principles he now holds?

Quaker. He has conſtantly Vindicated our Principles.

G. Keith. Whereas they ſay I have not taken notice of their Errors, I ſay I can appeal to *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, that in the year 1678. three Miniſters of *London* roſe up againſt me, and I oppoſed their Errors at that very time.

Auditor. What Miniſters were they?

G. Keith. They were Quakers. They accuſed me of three Principles in my Book, called, *The way caſt up*. The firſt was, *That Chriſts body roſe out of the Grave*. They ſaid it never did. 2. That I ſaid *It was Lawful to Pray to Jeſus Chriſt Crucified*. They denied it, and dared me to give an Inſtance of one *Engliſh* Quaker that I ever heard Pray to Chriſt. Whereupon *W. Penn* ſaid, *I am an Engliſh-man, and a Quaker, and I own I have oft Prayed to Chriſt Jeſus, even him that was Crucified*. And they anſwered, He is not an Antient Friend of the Miniſtery; and *G. Whitehead*, a man Antient in the Miniſtery, told them (there were forty or fifty preſent) *It is neither what* W. Penn, *nor what* G. Keith *ſays*, but

(*a*) Arthur Cook *a Preacher and Juſtice of Peace in* Penſilvania.
(*b*) *Too high a Title for ſuch who are guilty of ſuch groſs Errors.*

but let Scripture decide it: and he took the Bible, and opened it, and Read, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2 *To all that call upon the Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and Ours.* Their answer was *Paul* was dark and ignorant, as *G. Keith* is; for our part we know better (*o*)

Quaker. Will you say this, and not mention their Names.

G. Keith. I will not do it, it is not convenient; there is one of them a Citizen of very good repute, and therefore it will be better to conceal his Name.

Auditor. Go on to the last head.

Quaker. H. Goldney, you ought to name his name particularly, if thou dost not, thou art an Impostor.

Auditor. He has done enough.

G. Keith. I think it not convenient, we must use a little Policy as well as you. *Jo. Delawall* Published a Manuscript against me, wherein he charges me with Herefy, for saying, *The Light within was not sufficient without something else, and that something else was Christ without us.* Now they say there is no diference between them and me. I will cite a passage or two out of a Manuscript from *Pensilvania*, it is a thing that will satisfy your Consciences as much as any thing. I brought the Manuscripts, they were read at the yearly Meeting at *London*, 1694. and something was objected to the hand; and it was asked at *Samuel Jennings*, my Adversary, whether it was the hand of that man, and he said, he believed it was; and you will find it is matter of Doctrine at the bottom, for which they have Excommunicated me, however they would cloak it: Let them retract their Errors, and I will forgive them my Excommunication.

See the Book called, *Light and Life*, pag. 41. See what is here said by *G. Whitehead*, That there is not an outward coming of Christ to Judg the Quick and Dead. What I prove from *G. Whitehead*, is proved from *W. Penn*; for *W. Penn* has Authorized his Book. therefore it is the proof of them both. Here is the place 'Moreover *Christ said*, 'The Son of Man shall come in the Glory of his Father with his Angels, &c. Matt. 16.27,28. 'Luke 9. 26, 27 Now what is that Glory of the Father, in which his coming is, is it 'visible to the Carnal Eye? And when was that coming to be? Is it now to be looked 'for outwardly? But farther we do acknowledg the several comings of Christ, ac-'cording to the Scriptures, both that in the Flesh, and that in the Spirit, which is mani-'fest in several degrees as there is a growing from Glory to Glory. But three comings 'of Christ, not only that in the Flesh at *Jerusalem* and that in the Spirit, but also ano-'ther coming in the Flesh, yet to be expected; we do not read of, but a second coming 'without sin unto Salvation, which in the Apostles days was looked for.

And as concerning that noted place, 1 *Thes.* 4. 17. brought by *W. B.* to prove Christs coming without us to judgment *G. W.* denyeth it to be meant of his Personal coming, and useth a Sophism to contradict it, and wrest it to his inward coming: whereas all the stress of his Sophism lies in that, *We, We*, that remain; but the true Sense of these words is, those Saints, those Believers, that shall be living at that day, shall not prevent them that dyed in Christ before. It is an *enallage personæ* frequent in Scripture, putting we for they, like that of *James*, *therewith bless we God and Curse men.*

Now all these proofs he has Allegorized to Christ within, he has allegorized away his Birth, his Death, Resurrection, and Ascension, and coming to Judgment; and so we have nothing from Scripture to prove Christ's Death to be of any benefit to us, and

(*o*) *The Third was, that they blamed me, for saying the best Saints had need to come always to God by the Mediator the Man Christ Jesus, they said, They could come to God without him, and that part of Doctrine is to be found in* W. Shewen's *Book, a Quaker greatly owned by them.* Treatise of Thoughts, *see pag.* 37. 38.

we have no Argument to prove he came in the Flesh: And so all the proofs against Jews and Philosophers he has Allegorized away.

Thus you have had a proof from *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*. Now if you will adjourn the Meeting to some other time, or continue it a while longer, I am content. And I hope I have proved that I am not Petulant, and that I have had just cause to accuse them of these Errors. I was presented by a Grand jury at *Philadelgpia*; and the Presentment would have been Prosecuted, if the Government had not been changed, and I had been accused for endeavouring to alter the Government, which is Capital by their Law; and they would have found me guilty of Death, had they not been turned out of the Government, tho I was innocent: And when I objected against the Jury, they would not suffer one of the Jury to be cast. Now if I had been guilty of any Treasons and Offence against K. *William* and Q. *Mary*, (the King is alive, and God bless him) do you think that Governour *Fletcher*, (put into the Government by King *William* and Queen *Mary*) that was the Governor there, if he had found me guilty of High Treason, he would have passed me; but he ordered them to let fall the Indictment. (a).

Then the Company desired *G. Keith* to proceed if he had any more proofs against *G. Whitehead*.

G. Keith. Yes, I have:

See the Nature of Ch. pag. 39.

Says *G. Whitehead* to *R. Gordon*, *Dost thou look for Christ's coming again to appear outwardly in a bodily Existence? If thou dost thou mayest look until thy Eyes drop out before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him.* Now see how *G. Whitehead* has excused this, * he says, He did not mean it of Christ's coming to Judgment; but he meant it thus, because *R. Gordon* would needs have it, that Salvation was delayed till Christ's outward coming. I am apt to think he abuses *R. Gordon* (not that I would vindicate *R. Gordon* in every thing, for I think he did overcharge the Quakers in some things at that time, but now I do not accuse or acquit him.) But I say, he says, he only opposed that false Notion of *R. Gordon*, as if the Saints remained under their Pollution till the Resurrection from the Dead. Can you think so? He was a Protestant, and no Protestant will say any such thing. We say, we are saved by hope. *I* say, in a Scripture sense we may expect that great Salvation then even from all charge of Sin, tho not from any stain of Sin. Not that the sense of Pardon is not made manifest before that day; but that in that day, all that have Repented and Believed, he will clear them, before God, Angels and Men. The Devil will be ready to accuse them in that day, but Christ will then clear them. *It* will be a great solemn Assize, and there will be a solemn Acquitment to all that have sincere Repented of their Sins, and believed in the Lord Jesus Christ.

* *The real Quaker. A real Protestant.*

Quaker. Let the passage be read ont.

G. Keith. If we had not had these oppositions, we might have saved an Hour. I will

(a) *And I was cleared by a publick Writ, signed by the Deputy Governor,* C. Markham, *and the Counsel, in* Philadelphia, *which I have to show.*

will read the paſſage. *Doſt thou look for Chriſt, as the Son of Mary to appear outwardly in a bodily Exiſtence to ſave thee, according to thy words* Nature of *p.* 30. *If thou doeſt, thou mayeſt look unril thy Eyes drop out, before thou will ſee ſuch an appearance of him.* Ye ſee theſe are plain and expreſs Chriſtian. p. 29 words againſt Chriſt's outward coming. The Scripture ſaith we are ſaved by hope, and hope that is ſeen is not hope, our great Salvation in the full accompliſhment of it, is at the Reſurrection and Chriſts laſt coming, then will be the great Diſcharge and Acquitment, according to 2 *Tim.* 1. 18. and 2 *Tim.* 4. 16. The Lord grant that we may find mercy in that day, and that our ſins may not be laid to our charge. And *Acts* 3. 19. it is ſaid, *Repent, and be Converted, that your ſins may be blotted out, when the times of refreſhment ſhall come,* &c. The word is very well Tranſlated, when the times of Reanimation ſhall come, the Greek is, καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως.

Quaker. I deſire to be heard a word.

G. *Keith.* I have not done yet. I beg of you, I ſhall be but ſhort. I had ſaid I had upward of ſix Manuſcripts. What ſays *T. Elwood* (in his way of quibling) ſix and an half? All theſe Manuſcripts were read at the Meeting two years ago, and for the Cenſure they gave of them; I ſaid I thought they had (tho I confeſs I judg very mincingly) cenſured theſe unſound expreſſions. Yet *Tho. Elwood* tells me that I am guilty of Forgery, that I ſaid the Yearly Meeting ſaid any thing like it. Here is the Paper of the Yearly Meeting, this Paper ſhews whom it came from; does it find no fault with theſe Expreſſions in theſe *Penſilvanian* Papers. Here is ſeven or eight, I will read a few lines. I have brought an Original here, it is ſomewhat worn, but it may be read well enough; I am glad that my Neighbour has ſuch Charity for me, that he thinks I will not read wrong; I can read every word of it, tho it be ſomewhat worn. I ſhall forfeit the Name of an honeſt man, if I read one word different from the Original.

The words in *John Humphrey's* firſt Letter.

Who is he that dares to make a Diſtinction between Chriſt's Body and his Spirit, and to put aſunder what God hath joyned together? Is not this to divide Chriſt to uſe that Terms, viz. Chriſt within, and Chriſt without? when he himſelf, in that very Body that ſuffered, ſaid, he that eateth my Fleſh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him, *and in that day we ſhall know that it is the very ſame that liveth in us, that hath died for us, which before we could not come to know, altho any ſhould tell us of it; for Chriſt in us, is the hope of Glory, and they that draw us to look for Chriſt without, we are not to go forth after them, to divide Chriſt's Body from his Spirit. I perceive by* G. Keith's *Ten Articles of Faith, that they reliſh too much of Carnality, a Carnal Body of Chriſt in Heaven, a Carnal Election and Reprobation, a Carnal Juſtification and Adoption, a Carnal Day of Judgment and Reſurrection, beyond the Grave. I am grieved to hear ſome ſay, they did expect to be Juſtified by that Blood that was ſhed at* Jeruſalem. *Is't not to be carnally minded.*

I have not read the whole Letter, bnt an intire Paragraph of it. So farewel *Chriſt without.* You divide Chriſt, if you mention Chriſt without.

Now mark, theſe Ten Articles of mine, that he calls Carnal, they are ſhort, will you hear them? They are in Print. My Adverſaries ſent them over from *America* to *England*, and that before I came to *England*, as an Indicement againſt me; *Francis Bugg* met with them, and Printed them; my Adverſaries here ſent them about as a great Crime againſt me.

Some

Some of the Principles of *G. Keith* and his Friends.

1. *THat Bodily Sickneſs and Death came in by the Fall.* 2. *That Chriſt has now in Heaven a Soul and a Body, that is not the Godhead, but the Temple of it, and moſt gloriouſly united therewith.* 3. *That Chriſt's Body that was Crucified and Buried without us, roſe again without us; and is now in Heaven without us* 4. *That the Man Chriſt Jeſus will come again in that Body without us, to judg the Quick and the Dead.* 5. *That there ſhall be a general day of Judgment, that all the deceaſed Saints are in expectation of.* 6. *That we get not the Reſurrection of the Body, either in this mortal Life, or immediately after Death.* 7. *That Faith in the Man Chriſt without us, as he Died for us, roſe again, and is gone into Heaven, wrought in us by thy Spirit of Chriſt, is univerſally neceſſary to make Men true Chriſtians, and Children of God, born of the Free Woman, who have the Spirit of Adoption, crying,* Abba Father. 8. *That Chriſt's Obedience and Righteouſneſs, which he performed in, himſelf, without us, is imputed to us by Faith for the Remiſſion of Sins.* 9. *That Chriſt is not only God's Elect, but all that ſhall be ſaved from the beginning to the end of the World, are God's Elect, being choſen in him (not only before they Believe and Repent, but) before the Foundation of the World.* 10. *That all and every one of the Members of the Church of Chriſt (who are at age and can ſpeak) ought to confeſs with their Mouths, in the hearing of ſome of their fellow Members, the Fundamental Principles of their Chriſtian Faith, before they can be owned to be Members of the Church, that by the ſame, as well as by a good Life and Converſation, it may be known who are qualified to be Members of our Church, which is a boundary Term and Bond of our Union, the Spirit being the Principal, which may be eaſily done by Anſwering to ſome plain Queſtions.*

G. Keith his Ten Articles read all condemned to be Carnal by the *Perſilvania* Letter of *J. H.* a Preacher among the Quakers there, theſe Ten Articles were read at the Yearly Meeting at *London*, 1691. and the Letter that Condemned them, alſo read at the ſaid Yearly Meeting, and that Letter Juſtified by *Th. Elwood*, the Patron and Advocate for that Yearly Meeting; and thefore we ought, if we give Credit to *Th. Elwood*, to conclude that the Yearly Meeting at *London*, 1694. hath concluded all theſe Ten Articles to be Carnal, which yet expreſs the Common Faith of all Chriſtendom.

The Second Letter Read.

The Words of *John Humphery*'s Second Letter.

I craved no favour to my Paper from thee, nor them, but that word (only) which was the omiſſion of my Pen, and never intended to be put under a Buſhel, if occaſion did require. But however let Deceit and Malice have its full force and ſcope upon it, and that word (only) taken off the concluſion of my Paper, which that ſaying of our Saviour himſelf, when he Expounded his meaning unto them (who in theſe days had offended at his own words) will clear me of your Aſperſion, John 6. 63. *It is the Spirit that Quickneth the Fleſh profiteth nothing, ſo he himſelf aſcribed the Work of man's Salvation, and Sanctification, not to the Fleſh that Suffered, but to the Spirit that Quickned; not to the Blood that was Shed at* Jeruſalem, *but unto the Fleſh and Blood that is Spiritual, which the Saints was to feed upon, and their Robes was made white by; and it doth appear, that theſe that are otherwiſe minded, do not rightly diſcern the Lord's Body.*

Some

Some of his own Fraternity perſwaded him to put in the word, only, and that would excuſe the matter; he puts in the word, only, and he thinks it was againſt his Conſcience, and ſo bids put it out again.

Quaker. Whether do ye own ſanctification to the blood outwardly ſhed, or to the Spirit inwardly given.

G. Keith. I ſay to both, to the blood of Chriſt that was outwardly ſhed at *Jeruſalem*, and to the Spirit of Chriſt inwardly given, to believers.

Now they ſay that I have belied them, they never knew any that ſaid they were not ſanctified by that blood. You ſee what proofs I have brought, and therefore I muſt be an Apoſtate for accuſing them of errours. Who would have thought, but that the yearly Meeting, if they had any regard to the honour of Chriſt's blood, would have ſhown greater zeal againſt theſe Men, than to excommunicate me, for oppoſing their vile errors in *Penſilvania*, and for rendring that precious blood ſhed for us as an unprofitable thing, ſo trampling it under foot: But ye ſee, they have little at all cenſured them, and if you will believe their Patron, (as ye have cauſe, they owning his Books) nothing at all. *Th. Ellwood* affirms, I am guilty of Forgery, for ſaying that the yearly Meeting paſſed any reproof on thoſe paſſages, and whereas I was accuſed for ſaying, the light within was not ſufficient to ſalvation without ſomething elſe. I have a Letter from *B. Chambers*, one of the principal Evidences, that were againſt me, he owns that I mean, by that, *ſomething elſe*, not humane Learning, not the Letter of the Scripture, not outward preaching, but I mean only the Man Chriſt Jeſus, and his death and ſufferings and reſurrection, *&c.* Now here is a new book of *Caleb Puſey* come out, he calls it a modeſt account of the difference in Principles between *G. Keith* and his Adverſaries; and he would father it on me, tho it was not in my thoughts, that Jeſus of *Nazareth* cannot be ſomething elſe than the light within. I tell you, he would father it on me, becauſe I ſay there is but one only Chriſt. Now I ſay, Chriſt without does not admit of another Chriſt within, and Chriſt within does not admit of another Chriſt without us. But Chriſt without us admits of ſomething elſe within us, and that is his Spirit and Grace: And Chriſt within us, admits of ſomething elſe without, and that is his man-hood. This is not another Chriſt, than what the Scripture ſpeaks of; but the Light within is one thing, the body of Chriſt is another thing. Now they of *Penſilvania* and *Th. Elwood* give out that I differ from them in Doctrine, theſe men ſay I do not: What Confuſion is here among them that ſay they are in Unity? I ſay the Light within is not ſufficient, without the Light without, Chriſt without us, yet the Sufficiency of the Light and Grace of God within, in a true ſenſe, I deny not, but own. And whereas they ſay, the moſt of my Proofs I have brought, have been from Philoſophy; but it has been only, that I may, by true Philoſophy, overthrow their falſe Phyloſophy, which deſtroys their Faith. I need not bring Scriptnre to prove theſe Points, becauſe they now profeſs to own them; but the thing is, the Honour of Infallibility, and that they have accuſed *G. Keith*; that *G. Keith* has not charged them truly. And here are the two things, their own infallibility, and that I have unjuſtly accuſed them. Now whether I have or no, ſee by the Articles: But if they grant or yeild, that they have any Errors in any of their Books, or unſound paſſages, that they need retract, and correct, then they are found the falſe Accuſers againſt *G. Keith*, and *G. Keith's* found Innocent. But this will be hard for them to own; Firſt, That they have Erred: And Secondly, That they have falſely accuſed *G. Keith*, for ſaying they did Err. I have here a Teſtimony from *W. Penn*, to prove that Bodily Death did not come in by Man's Sin; and then it followeth that the Reſurrection of the Body doth not come by Chriſt's Reſurrection.

W. Penn

W. Penn's words are, in Anſwer to *Muggleton* and *Reeve*, p. 55. *If the Fleſh of Beaſts is capable of Dying, rotting, and going to duſt, who never ſinned, why ſhould not Man have Dyed, and gone to duſt, though he had never ſinned.*

You ſee this is almoſt expreſly in terms. And whereas *J. H.* calleth one of my Articles, a Carnal Reprobation.

There is nothing about Reprobation in my Articles, and the word Carnal is not in any of the Ten.

Auditor. Now let him that Anſwers for *W. Penn* and *Geo. Whitehead* tell us what he ſays to them Articles. But they ſaid nothing to them good or bad, rare Defendents!

G. Keith. I happened to charge *W. Penn* with ſelf contradiction, will you hear that proved? It was in my Printed Paper.

G. Keith has contradicted himſelf. How? Not as to Principles or Practices, but as to his Opinion of *W. Penn* and *G. Whitehead*, but I diſtinguiſh betwixt *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* Orthodox, and *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* Hetrodox, ſo far as I quoted them, as Orthodox, I ſtand to theſe quotations; but when in other Books and places they have contradicted them, they are accountable for their Contradictions, and not I. So not the *G. Whitehead* Hetrodox, and guilty of theſe vile Errors I have commended, but the *G. Whitehead* Orthodox, and the like of *W. Penn.*

Now I beg your Patience for one or two Quotations more, before I have done. It is out of *Tho. Elwood*, to ſhew you that *Tho. Elwood* charges me with forgery, becauſe I ſaid the Yearly Meeting did cenſure ſome of theſe unſound Papers. Here is the paſſage, it is but ſhort, p. 84. *T. Ellwoods* further Diſcovery. *Here ye ſee Friends* (ſaith *T. Elwood*) *that that Paper of the Yearly Meeting is ſo far from owning them of the other ſide, as he calls them, that is the Friends in* America, *to be guilty of unſound and Erronious Doctrines* (*which* G. K. *here Expreſly ſaith, it doth*) *that it doth not undertake to determine, whether the Offence* (*ſaid to be given by ſome perſons*) *was through Erronious Doctrines, and unſound Expreſſions, or through weakneſs, frowardneſs, want of Wiſdom, and right underſtanding. And yet this man hath the confidence and falſeneſs* (meaning G. K.) *to ſay poſitively, that paper doth own them guilty of holding unſound and erronious Doctrines.* This was my Charity to them, that I thought they cenſured them, in ſome part or degree at leaſt.

Now theſe are their words in their Yearly Meeting Paper, 1694. *London*, from which I gathered, that they cenſured the words of thoſe in *Penſilvania*: 'And although 'it appears that ſome few Perſons have given offence, either through Erronious Doc-'trines, unſound Expreſſions, or weakneſs, forwardneſs, want of Wiſdom, and right 'underſtanding, I conſtrued, *or* to be equivalent to *and*, as ſometimes it is: Now ſee if I was not more charitable to the Yearly Meeting, than he is to them. Here you ſee that that Paper of the Yearly Meeting. is ſo far from owning them guilty of unſound Doctrines, which *G. Keith* ſays it does, *&c.* By all which it is plain, that not only *Th. Elwood*, but all that approve his Books, approve and juſtify all theſe Vile Errors, I have proved them in *Penſilvania*, guilty of, and if he may be credited, the Yearly Meeting at *London*, 1694. is equally guilty with them.

Quaker. This is only thy different apprehenſion.

G. Keith. He ſays the Yearly Meeting has not found fault with any of theſe Expreſſions.

Now let me read one Paſſage more, it is but about ſix Lines, and I have done with the Printed quotations at preſent. pag. 99. He blames me for comparing the Books of Friends, to the Books of the *Greek* and *Latin* Fathers, p. 99. For further Diſcovery.

In

In comparing (*says* Tho. Ellwood) the Books of Friends to the Books of them called *the Greek and Latin Fathers*, he has not done as a Friend and Brother, but as an Enemy, in supposing Friends Books to have been written by no better guidance nor clearer sight than theirs who lived and writ in those dark times.

You see how modest they are here.

Auditors. They gave a shout, signifying their dislike, that the Quakers Books should be preferred so far to the Greek and Latin Fathers, next to the days of the Apostles.

Quaker, *N. M.* It is very well that the whole Paragraph be read, that it may give the more satisfaction to the Auditory: which was accordingly done. *T. Ellwood* saith, He (*viz. G. K.*) turns off, and says, I reflect not only on him, but on the late Christian Teachers and Writers, who have corrected the Errors and unsound Expressions contain'd in the Books of them called the Greek and Latin Fathers.

Now hear what he further says, In comparing the Books of Friends to the Books of them called Greek and Latin Fathers, *ut supra.*

Quaker, *F. Waite.* I have made a few Observations on the whole, one or two particular, the other are general. The first is, that he charges *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn* to destroy the Object of Faith. Now, when he speaks of some Doctrines, that were preached by him in 1678, and that he was reproved for saying it was lawful to pray to Jesus Christ, he has vindicated *W. Penn* as to this Point, who said he did so. ——— Also he has vindicated *G. Whitehead*, saying that ——— He directed not to what either of them could say, but what Scripture says; and he cites them a clear passage, that was then believed by him, and, I believe, by all Quakers. The other particular Observation I did note, is, that the Quakers have not used to recite the whole Author they write against; and I appeal to you, whether *G. Keith*, in the opposition he has made, has ever repeated a whole Author. These are my particular Observations. The general is, that what has been casually dropt, and I believe there are none concerned on this occasion, but (I say) they may sometimes be apt to drop some Expressions, that they will not stand by. But to urge these against the whole Party, is too hard, and is very * uncharitable; and therefore, I hope, you will not conclude the whole body concerned in it. And *G. Keith* hath been conversant among us eight and twenty years, or more, and has preached the Doctrines owned by us, and writ many Books that related to fundamental Articles of Faith; I believe him that they were owned by the People he was joyned with. And at the yearly meeting, the charge against him, and his expulsion, was not matter of Doctrine, but Practice, which was turbulent: And therefore he has apostatized from what he was before, from the meekness and integrity that is agreeable to the Doctrine of Christianity.

Stranger. G. Keith, I see you are almost spent, I will answer for you. He says, it was the whole body that was against you; it was the worse, that the Excommunication should be from the whole yearly Meeting, without mentioning any thing in particular. For a man to apostatize, is to apostatize from the whole Faith; but for a man to differ with respect to particular things, this is not Apostasie.

G. Keith. The words of the Excommunication run thus. "I am a man of no Chri-
"stian Spirit, I have dismember'd myself from the Church of Christ. If they had said from this particular Society, it might have passed; but they say, from the Church of Christ. And why? Because there is no Church of Christ on Earth, but the Quakers; and no Representative of them, but the Yearly Meeting in *Gracechurch-street*. You see how weak that man's Objections are. [*The Auditory shouted.*

Quaker, *H. Goldney.* This man asserts a Lye, and then the People are taken with it, as if it were a Truth

* G. Keith *doth not charge it on the whole, but only on the Guilty, and such as cloak and excuse them.*

G. Keith. If I have ſpoken amiſs, I am willing to be brought to a tryal. He ſays I have anſwer'd many Books, wherein I have not recited all the Books I have anſwer'd. It is true, and I blame not them for not doing ſo. But they ſay, I only take bits and ſcraps here and there. I ſay, what cauſe have I to recite *G. Whitehead* and *W. Penn*'s whole Books to you, when they have not done ſo? I think it ſufficient to give an account of their ſenſe from full Periods and Paragraphs. He ſays I have already cleared *George Whitehead* and *William Penn* from that charge that they have not deſtroyed the Object of Faith. And I ſay I have proved that they have deſtroyed the Object of Faith; if they have at other times Owned it, let them diſown and retract their Errors; I am not to account for their Contradictions. They have Contradicted themſelves; they have diſowned the Object of Faith; and if I have charged them with it, this is no Contradiction in me, but in them.

Quaker. H. Goldney made an interruption, while *G. K.* was ſpeaking, as he oft did, and gave great offence to the Auditory with his impertinencies and reflections, calling *G. K.* Lyer, Impoſtor, Apoſtate.

G. Keith. The reading of this Paper, if ye pleaſe, ſhall conclude this Meeting. After *T. Ellwood* came out with his further diſcovery, I made my Complaint to the Monthly Meeting at *Bull and Mouth*, againſt the Forgeries and falſe Accuſations that his Book was filled with, and I begged of them, that they would hear my Charge againſt him; but they would not ſuffer me, they ſaid *I* might print, as *T. Ellwood* did, but *I* ſaid *I* could not, they have a Stock, *I* have not. Whereupon *I* went to ſome of the Church-Party that favour'd me, and told them, if I could not get a meeting to bear me, my deſign was to give forth a printed Advertiſement of a Meeting to clear myſelf of theſe things, and they might be preſent if they would. Some of their Party ſaid to me, George, *do not, they, or ſome of them would give me a meeting.* Accordingly they gave me a meeting. They took notice of ſome of *Ellwood*'s Forgeries and Abuſes; ſome of them have, I hope, that Courage, that I believe they would not be offended nor afraid if I named them. They have ſaid in their Paper, *T. Ellwood* has done me wrong.

Quaker, H. Goldney. Let us know their names, who they are.

G. Keith. We muſt uſe ſome little Policy, as well as ye. Some of them are eminent among you. Here is a Copy of a Paper containing an account of the matter. There were, I think, nine or ten of them, *H. Goldney*, if I ſhould name them, would not deny them to be his Brethren.

Quaker, H. Goldney. I dare thee to name their names, or elſe thou art a Lyar, an Impoſtor, a Cheat; I dare ſay it is a Cheat. And turning to *G. K.* he ſaid, O thou Lyer, thou contentious Creature!

G. Keith. See this little man's paſſion now, what is he but a Creature, and a contentious Creature? I contend for Truth, he and they againſt it. I will not name them without their conſent; only bid this angry man, *Henry Goldney*, be ſilent, and I will read their Paper, containing their Cenſure againſt *T. Ellwood* in divers * particulars.

* Note, *They told me, It was ſufficient to name a Few of Many, to prove* T. E. *guilty of wronging me in his Books.*

The true Copy of a Paper containing a Cenſure and Judgment of a Meeting of Friends, (owned by Tho. Ellwood*'s Brethren, to be in Unity with them, and generally in good Repute among them) held at* London *the* 12th *Month,* 1694, *in divers weighty particulars.*

IN Thomas Ellwood's *Book, entituled, A further Diſcovery,* &c. *pag.* 31 *Thomas Ellwood* blames *G. K.* for miſtating the Controverſie, and cunningly ſliding in the word *Within*, when he knew it was not in the words charged, nor in the words pro-

ved.

A true

A true Copy of the three Judgments, p. 6. are these words: All which are something else than the People called Quakers understand by the Light, to wit, the light in every man's Conscience, which *G. K.* alledgeth, is Proof that *G. K.* intended the Light within.

In Benjamin Chambers *Letter, dated* Philadelphia *the 24th of the fourth Month,* 1693. *one of the four credible Evidences against* G. K. *are these words following.* The substance of what *Tho. Fitzwaters* had said, to wit, that according to his own Apprehension of thee, thou didst not believe the Light of Christ within Man is sufficient for Salvation without something else: To which words thee didst then in the audience of the Meeting forthwith reply, *No more I do not, without something else*

In John Delaval's *Letter, dated the* 24th *of the* 10th *Month,* 1692. *are these words, cited out of* G. W's *Book:* That the Light which is sufficient to convince of Sin, and leads out of it, is sufficient to guide unto Salvation, but such is the Light of Christ in every man.

John Humphry's Two Letters read, and both to the same purpose.

T. E. *Further Discovery,* &c. *pag.* 101. *are these words:* And this makes a Verbal Confession; yea, a bare Verbal Confession, sufficient to yoke them, as he phrases it, together in Church-Fellowship.

Reasons and Causes of the Separation, pag. 22. *ad finem*; Tho. Elwood *leaves this out, viz.* Touching these necessary and fundamental Principles of Christian Doctrine, as well as that their Conversation is such as becomes the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. *Pag.* 36. That the Church of *Christ* is the multitude of sincere Believers in Christ, who ought to manifest their Faith to one another, by the living confession of the Mouth, flowing from the living Faith in the Heart, accompanied with the seal and confirmation of a Holy and Christian life and conversation.

Pag. 103. *Tho. Ellwood* accuseth *G. K.* for giving of false Quotation, or forging Quotation out of *Robert Barkly's* Book. *G. K's* Quotation compared with *Robert Barkly's* agrees, as quoted; *Reasons and Causes,* &c. *pag.* 16. for Substance of Doctrine, *pag.* 24, 25, 26. in expres words, *pag.* 106. *T. E.* admits of Substance.

Let the Quotations be read out of R. B's *Anarc.*

Further Discovery, p. 19. *Tho. Ellwood* accuseth *G. K.* that he blames Friends that they were gone too much from the outward to the inward. But *G. K. p.* 20. which *Tho. Ellwood* brings for Proof, saith, That he blames some persons for not rightly and fully preaching Christ without; so that *Tho. Ellwood's* consequences seems not fair, but strain'd.

Pag. 22. *Tho. Ellwood* accuseth *George Keith* of a Fallacy, in declaring, he refused not to go forth at the Yearly Meeting: which Fallacy alledged, was, That *G. K.* should refuse to go out some one day of the yearly meeting: but that not appearing to us by any Quotation, the supposed Fallacy appears not. And further; whereas *Tho. Elwood* alledges, that he was led into this Mistake by *G. K's* obscure way of writing; for altho' in *pag.* 14. nor 18. of the Book *Reasons and Causes,* as *Tho. Ellwood* unduly argueth *, yet in *pag.* 3. *Plea of the Innocent,* quoted by himself, *pag* 19 of his first Book called an *Epistle,* &c. we find *G. K.* gives account, the Yearly Meeting at *Philadelphia* was in the first week of the 7th month 1691.

**There is not mentioned any Day, Month or Year wherein the yearly Meeting at* Philad. *was held.*

Further Discovery, p. 26 *Tho. Ellwood* saith, *G. K.* asks why they contradicted the sound Judgment of a Monthly Meeting at *Philadelphia,* passing due Censure upon *W. S.* sixth month thereafter, and saith, It doth not sound as if it came from a sound Judgment; as if a Judgment now were capable of contradicting a Judgment that should be given six months after; whereas it appears by the date of the Judgment given by the publick Friends, to be nine months after the Yearly Meeting, the first being as above, the 1st of the seventh month, 91; the other bearing date the 4th of the fourth month, 92: The which Book, *Tho. Ellwood* being so conversant in, looks as if he could not be

ignorant of the adjourned Meeting, being six months after the Yearly Meeting, to wit, the 27*th* of the twelfth month, as appears in *pag.* 10. *Reasons and Causes*; and that wherein the supposed Judgment of the Yearly Meeting is, is dated nine months after the Yearly Meeting.

In the same Book, pag. 35. *Tho. Ellwood* alledgeth, That he no where gave that as the only, or any Reason, why the Meeting could not adjourn, to wit, because the Book and Clark was gone. *Pag.* 36, & 37. he adds, Let *G. K.* clear himself fairly of this if he can, till then I shall take it for certain, that that Monthly Meeting was ended and broken up, part of the Friends gone away, the Clerk gone, the Book in which the Proceedings of the Meeting should be recorded gone, before the adjournment was made, and consequently that Adjournment not good, but invalid. *Ditto, pag.* 42, & 43. Whereas *Tho. Ellwood* should have brought matter of Fact, to prove *G. K.* guilty of the Separation, instead thereof, he argues, as we think, unfairly by logical Nicety.

Pag. 42. he blameth *G. K.* greatly, for not putting the Printer's name to some of his Books. But it's well known this hath been the frequent practice of the People called *Quakers*, not to put the Printer's name to their Books, in times of suffering.

Pag. 91. *Tho. Ellwood* alledges, he did not understand that the Doctrine of the Faith of Christ, as he died, being necessary to our Christianity and Salvation, *&c.* was by him reputed a Doctrine in Controversie between *G. K.* and others, in *America*, when in several places of his Books it plainly appears, it was the principal Doctrine in Controversie. See *Reasons and Causes, pag.* 8, & 21, 22. with many others.

G. Keith. The Paper is read, the Question was not concerning the Light indefinitely, but whether the Light within was sufficient to Salvation, without the Man Christ and his Death, *&c.* *Thomas Ellwood* accuseth me unjustly, That I cunningly slid in the word *Light within*; as if that were not the state of the Question, but Light indefinitely comprehending Christ both Light without and within. But ye see how the citations they bring in their Paper clear me, and shew *T. Ellwood* his injustice against me. —— You see there is the Light within, not the Light without, in the Citations they have brought to clear me, and to blame *T. Ellwood.*

And here is another thing they find fault with, as to *T. Ellwood*'s wronging me, as if I had made a meer Verbal Confession, a sufficient qualification to a Member of the Church of Christ.

See here they cite my Book, *Reasons and Causes, p.* 22. —— Take notice how they notifie his Forgery, that he leaves out my words, —— —— *T. Ellwood* says, I make a meer Verbal Confession a Qualification for being a Member of the Church. But I say not so, as if a Verbal Confession were enough, but as well a Conversation, such as becomes the Gospel, is necessary to qualifie a Member.

So my Book is, Such a Conversation as becomes the Gospel, *p.* 36. *Reasons and Causes, &c.* —— —— I appeal to you, is not this more than a Verbal Confession? *T. Ellwood* charges me to say, That a meer Verbal Confession is enough to make a man a Member of the Church of Christ.

Now, *p.* 103 *T. Ellwood* accuseth me unjustly (as his own Brethren do observe) for giving a false Quotation out of *R. Barclay*'s Book called the *Anarchy, &c.* but they clear me, and declare it to be true, as it is.

T. Ellwood quibbles about Substance, finding fault with my Saying. Somewhere it agrees in Substance with *R. B.* as elsewhere in expres words. —— Now these men take notice that *T. Ellwood* is unfair in taking that liberty to himself he will not allow to me: They observe, he admits of Substance of Doctrine in his own Citations, but will not allow it to me.

Another thing *T. Ellwood* accuses *G. Keith* (as they observe in their Censure) that he blames them for going too much from the *outward* to the *inward*: But these are not my words, nor sence. And they censure *T. Ellwood* for making a strained Consequence on

my,

my words; for, tho' I blamed them for not rightly preaching *Christ without*, yet not for going to the *inward* Light: for if they did go rightly to God's Light and Gift in their Hearts, they would not hold such gross Errors. But he says, I blame them for going from the *outward* to the *inward*, which is not so. See *p.* 22.

Again, they censure him in his blaming me for not naming the Day, Month, or Year wherein that Yearly meeting at *Philadelphia* was held, which he makes the ground of his perversion, and would excuse it.

You see he argues like a rare Logician. He says, I do not name the Year, nor Day; nor is it in *p.* 14, nor *p.* 18. But what then? I do it in another page. This is rare Logick. Now, I say, you have both in *p.* 3. quoted from *The Plea of the Innocent.* Which *p.* 3. *T. Ellwood* has quoted for another purpose, but could not see it for that.

And all this Proof is, that I did not tell it in *p.* 14, nor *p.* 18 but I did it in *p.* 3. His Argument is a Sophism, and is faulty in not making a sufficient enumeration.

Again they censure him for charging me with Nonsence. Pray, may not a meeting held six months after contradict a meeting going before? Very well. But he has given out that I am so weak a man, that *I* cannot write sence. This morning one came to me with *Henry Goldney*, and said, People would hoot at me in the Meeting, (but it is fulfilled on themselves) thinking me craz'd: And so here is a Paper against me, that *I* cannot speak sence: And why? Because he feigns, that *I* said a meeting six months before contradicts a meeting held six months after it; when there is no such thing; but that a meeting six months after, contradicts a meeting six months before.

When *Tho. Ellwood* could not prove, that *I* began the Separation at *Philadelphia*, by any Evidence of Matter of Fact, he essays to do it by false Logick, arguing, That the Cause must be before the Effect. Therefore because, *I* say, *Th. Loid* and they that were Magistrates went away, this was the beginning of the Separation, and a cause of it. And so when he cannot bring a reason in Matter of Fact, he will go to false Logick for it: So *I* answer'd his Argument, saying, All learned men, that write of causes and effects, acknowledge that a priority of time is not necessary to the cause; but it is enough that there be a priority of nature; the first moment the Sun was created, there was light. And then besides, the cause cannot be the effect, says he; if their going away from that meeting were the cause of the separation, it was not the effect. But I said to him, formal and material causes may be both cause and effect. As for example; The formal and material causes of a man, are his Soul and Body, and they are the man. The material and formal causes of this House, are the Stones, the Bricks, the Timber, and the Fashion. Now here these causes are the effect. Now *Th. Loid*'s going away was a cause of the Separation, and yet was a beginning of the Separation: And is it not shameful? They accuse me of Separation, but they run to a perversion of Philosophy to prove it by, that the cause is before the effect; when they have no other Arguments against me, but false Logick and vain Philosophy and Deceit, and his own Brethren here in this Paper do censure him, for his arguing unfairly by Logical nicety.

Here is another Observation of these honest men: they censure him for saying, he did not understand that the Doctrine of the Faith of Christ, as he died, *&c.* being necessary to our Salvation, was reputed a Doctrine in Controversie betwixt us.——Whereas the principal Doctrine in Controversie between them and me, was about the Faith of Christ, as he died, *&c.* whether necessary to our (*a*) Salvation.

Here is something also to take notice of, that he blames me as not fair, for not putting my Name to my Book, nor the Name of the Printer. Now the Quakers have done so in *England*, in Suffering Times; and yet the Printer in *America* was prosecuted by an Act of Parliament, for not printing his Name to some of my Books, and they took away

(*a*) Note, W. Penn (*as is proved*) *hath said, We need not preach it, the necessary consequence whereof is, They need not believe it.*

his

his Letters and Frame: But, *I* find, that which is Perſecution in *England*, is eſteem'd good Juſtice in *Philadelphia*.

Quaker, N. Marks. I have ſomething to propoſe to you, if you pleaſe. We are all in general very apt, and too apt, to have a good Opinion of ourſelves, it is very near to Mankind to do ſo. You have very well anſwer'd the Deſign of this meeting in this; you have heard him with a great deal of temper. I deſire you further to conſider, that all conſiderate men, when they hear one part, hear but with one Ear. So far as *G. Keith* thinks fit to make this publick, you may expect an Anſwer, and I hope you will reſerve one Ear to hear that. I have a Paper that ſome perſons concerned in this Challenge have ſent, that they deſire may be read. *Which was conſented to.*

G. Keith. The truth is, I could be almoſt content to go away, and ſay nothing to it, there is ſo little of value in it. They ſay *I* began with them, but they began with me in *Penſylvania*. *I* was doing my duty, in preaching Chriſt without, and Chriſt within; they charged me with preaching two Chriſts. *I* went to ſome of them about it, but they took their part againſt me. *I* laid it before the Miniſtry at the Yearly meeting, they alſo took their part. Now, you know, he that affirms, on him lies the buſineſs of proving. *W. Penn*, when *I* was opening a place of Scripture, he charges me with being an Apoſtate and Impoſtor. Here he charges me with being an Apoſtate; *I* ſay, to him it belongs to make his charge good, but he goes away. ——— At the Yearly meeting, *I* put it to him to make it good. *I* do not doubt but this meeting will ſound through the Nation. They urge me to Printing; I ſay again, I have not either Eſtate or Time to print Book upon Book. And tho' I have not anſwer'd the ſaid two *(b)* Books, why may not I ſay as they do, They are not worth anſwering? As for example, There is a Book called, *The Snake in the Graſs*, (I would not vindicate all things in it) but they have been urged to anſwer it; their Anſwer is, it is not worth anſwering: This man that prints this half-ſheet ſays, it cannot be ſuppoſed that *G. Keith* can anſwer eighteen ſheets of Paper in a Meeting. Why can it not be ſuppoſed? But *G. Fox* can anſwer an hundred ſheets of Paper in a few Pages. He has anſwer'd Books of ten or twelve ſheets in a few lines. And as for their upbraiding my Friends for not bearing the charge of Printing my Books, they that own me here, are not many of them rich, and I would not put them to it. But now there is the thing, the Controverſie is, whether the rich Church, or the poorer Church, be the Ch. of Chriſt. *G. Keith*'s is the *(c)* poor Church, and theirs is the rich Church, and I am not aſham'd of my Poverty, ſeeing I have not done any diſhoneſt thing. I have weaken'd my Eſtate by printing what I have printed already; there is a Printer here, that can own *I* have paid near forty pounds to him for Printing. Now they upbraid me for my Poverty. Their Church is the true Church, becauſe the rich Church; and ours the falſe Church, becauſe the poor Church.

Quaker, N. Marks. You ſhould hear one ſide but with one Ear, and leave the other free for the other ſide.

G. Keith. I am perſwaded the Reaſons given in the Paper read at the beginning, were no juſt Reaſon for their not appearing. But though ſome comparisons are odious, yet give me leave to make a compariſon. May a Malefactor make this excuſe; You ſhall not call me before a Juſtice without my conſent? If a man rob me, I may complain of him as a Robber, and without his conſent call him to account; but here is a ſtrange thing,

---

(b) So nor have they anſwer'd my Book, Groſs Error and Hypocriſie detected; *nor my Book againſt* Samuel Jennings. *So here are Two for Two: But I think I have effectually anſwer'd them here, as to the main, and ſo, I hope, will many others judge.*

(c) I call it not G. Keith's *Church, otherwiſe than as related to them as one of them; as I call the other their Church.* N. Mark's *Church*, i. e. *to which he is related; but he did well to own his Fallibility, ſeeing he gave ſo great a Proof of it not long ago, by ſeverely accuſing a poor innocent Maid-ſervant of his of Theft, whoſe Innocency ſoon after was manifeſted to him.*

inju-

injuring men may not be called to account without their consent, it will trespass against the Law, and intrenches upon liberty of Conscience. *I* was advised to go before the Lord Mayor of *London*, and *I* did, and told him, *I* hoped it would give no offence to Authority: for the things *I* was concerned in were the common Doctrines of Christianity; if there be any Tumult, says *I* it shall not be on my side: And the Lord Mayor was pleased to consent to it. Now their printed Paper seems to reflect on the publick Authority, and not what *I* have done. [*And thus the Meeting peaceably ended, between the second and third hour in the Afternoon.*

Note, If any of my Adversaries object, That divers of these Proofs here brought, were brought formerly in my Book against *W. Penn* and *G. W.* call'd, *A short List of the vile and gross Errors which* T. Ellwood *hath replied to in his printed Book called* Truth defended; I answer, *I* know not any one of them that he has sufficiently answer'd unto, to give the least Satisfaction to any sound Christian, his Answers being meerly Evasions and Perversions, as *I* should have shown, if he had appear'd. But beside, there are many new Proofs here brought, beside the former, which *I* am well satisfied they can never truly answer, but by a sincere and free Confession of their gross Errors, and a hearty retracting and relinquishing them. And if any that were present at that Meeting, or may happen to read this printed Account, with the proofs brought out of their Books in full Periods and Paragraphs, as often as there was any occasion, are desirous to see the Books, and to read the Proofs in the said Books, that were then brought, or any others that may be brought, *I* freely offer them that are sober and impartial persons, to let them have the free sight and view of them, leisurely to read and consider them, if they please to call at my House. And *I* the rather make this Offer, because divers of these Books are not easily to be had, not being in the hands of many. And because *I* had not time enough to read divers other great Proofs that *I* had, being hinder'd with the impertinent Digressions of those that interposed, (whom we had no just Cause to hear, pretending no Deputation from the persons they spoke for, and therefore only were permitted, by Favour, to shew their Impertinencies). *I* therefore think fit to add some other few very considerable Proofs out of these mens Books, and perhaps one or two out of Books approved and commended by them, and some few more of *W. Penn*'s and *George Whitehead*'s Self-Contradictions.

A N

AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

Some other Conſiderable Paſſages for Proofs, out of theſe Mens Books, relating to the foregoing Heads; and ſome few more of W. Penn's *and* G. Whitehead's *Self-Contradictions, which were deſign'd to have been read at the Meeting at* Turners-Hall, *11th of the Month call'd* June, 1696. *but for the Diverſions made, could not then be read.*

IN *George Whitehead*'s Book called *The Divinity of Chriſt*, he hath this moſt unſound and ſcandalous paſſage concerning Chriſt, how a Sacrifice, and his Blood.

In his Anſwer to *T. Danſon*'s *Synopſis of Quakeriſm*, p. 70. firſt he ſets down the words of *John Owen* thus: *The Sacrifice denotes his Human Nature, whence God is ſaid to purchaſe his Church with His own Blood,* Acts 20. 28. *for He offer'd Himſelf through the eternal Spirit; there was the Matter of the Sacrifice, which was the Human Nature of Chriſt, Soul and Body; His Soul was made an Offering for Sin, Iſa.* 53. 10. *His Death had the Nature of a Sacrifice.*

Againſt theſe ſound words of *John Owen* he quarrels, and contradicts thus:

Anſw. 'Theſe paſſages are but darkly and confuſedly expreſs'd; as alſo we do not read 'in Scripture, that the Blood of God, by which he purchas'd his Church, is ever call'd the 'Blood of the Human Nature: nor that the Soul of Chriſt was the Human Nature, or 'was put to death with the Body, (for the Wicked could not kill the Soul) though his 'Soul was made an Offering for Sin, and he poured it out to Death, (he bore the Sin of 'many, and made interceſſion for Tranſgreſſors) but what Death (and in what manner) 'was it, is a Myſtery truly to know; for his Soul in his own being was immortal, and 'and the Nature of God is divine, and therefore that the Blood of God ſhould be of hu'man (or earthly) nature, appears inconſiſtent; and where doth the Scripture call the 'Blood of God Human, or Human Nature? Neither do we read, that the Blood which 'beareth Record in the Earth, and agrees in one with the Spirit, (and which purgeth the 'Conſcience, waſheth and cleanſeth the Believer in the Light from all Sin) was ever called 'by the *Apoſtles* the Blood of the Human Nature. Nor do we read, that the Saints did 'eat and drink Fleſh and Blood that was of a human nature, to receive Divine Life in 'them thereby: for the Water of Life and Blood of Chriſt, which are ſaid to waſh, ſan'ctifie, and juſtifie; which agrees with the Spirit in thoſe Works and Effects We never 'read, that they are called in Scripture by the name of *Human Nature*, for the Spirit that 'quickens is divine, and it is the Spirit that gives Life, the Fleſh profiteth nothing, '*John* 6. Now this unſound Doctrine of *G. W.* doth ſo well agree with that in *John Humphrey*'s two Letters abovementioned, that *John Humphrey* ſeems to have been his Diſciple in the Caſe: and it is certain this ſort of Doctrine of *G. Whitehead* hath corrupted the Minds of many. We ſee he will not own either the Fleſh, or Blood of Chriſt, or Soul of Chriſt, to belong to the human nature.

Annotat. Before *I* underſtood the Myſtery of *Iniquity* and *Antichriſtianiſm* that lay hid, under the finding fault with this name or term *Human Nature of Chriſt, and his Humanity*, obſerving that divers found fault with it, *I* was ready to excuſe them, thinking, that tho' they diſowned the term *Human*, yet they owned that ſignified by it, to wit, the real *Manhood* of Chriſt, having a real Soul and Body, that is not the Godhead, but moſt gloriouſly united therewith. And accordingly *I* did in part excuſe them, as in my Book *The True Chriſt owned, pag.* 20 and *pag.* 105 I cited ſome words of *Hilarius, Lib.* 10. *de Trinitate*; *Quid per Naturam Humani corporis concepta ex Spiritu*

ritu S. caro judicatur. i. e. *Why is the Fleſh conceived of the Holy Ghoſt, judged by the nature of an Human Body?* But neither *Hilarius* nor I judged that the Body, though conceived of the Holy Ghoſt, was any part of the Subſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, the Particle *of* in that place denoting the Holy Ghoſt to be the Efficient Cauſe of that Conception, but not the Material. But that my Mind and Senſe, that Chriſt had the true Nature of Man, of Soul and Body, neither of which were the Godhead, was ſound then as now, and the ſame as now, plainly appears from *Page* 20. of my Book above cited, where I ſay, *Human Soul may ſignify the true Soul of Man, having all the eſſential properties of man's Soul, and its whole Perfection. And if in this ſenſe any will ſay, That Chriſt hath a Human Soul, and call the Manhood of Chriſt his Humanity, there needeth no contention about it: For in the* Latin *Tongue we have not a word ſo proper as* Humanitas, *to ſignify the Manhood; and if we may ſay* Humanitas *in* Latin, *we may ſay in* Engliſh, *Humanity.* *G. Whithead* his Objection againſt the word *Human*, as ſignifying Earthly, hath the ſame force againſt calling Chriſt *Adam*, coming from the *Hebrew* word *Adamah*, that ſignifieth Earth. And the Scripture calleth the Man Chriſt the ſecond *Adam*; and certainly the Man Chriſt had not only that which was Heavenly, but had even our Earthly part, but without ſin; his Body being nouriſhed with Earthly Food, which Body now glorified is Heavenly. But that I differed as much in Doctrine from *G. Whithead* then as now, as concerning the Blood of Chriſt, and the ſenſe of that place of Scripture, *Acts* 20. 28. (what that Blood of God was, wherewith he purchaſed his Church, he affirming it was the Blood, not of the Human Nature or Humanity, but of the Divine Nature, as may be ſeen above) appears in my Book above-mentioned, *The true Chriſt owned*, pag. 94. I expreſly ſay, 'I grant that there is ſuch a figurative ſpeech of the Communication of Names 'and Properties, whereby the Man Chriſt is called God, and alſo God is called Man; 'and God is ſaid to have ſhed his Blood, although Chriſt as God hath not Blood to ſhed, 'but only as Man; yet by reaſon of that moſt rare and wonderful Union betwixt the 'Godhead and Manhood, the Blood of the Man Chriſt is called the Blood of God, '*Acts* 20. 28. This may ſerve as one great Inſtance, to ſhew, That as I am not changed in this Doctrine from what I was many years ago (that Book of mine being printed *Anno* 1679.), ſo I did then as widely differ from *G. W.* in that great Article of Faith, as I do now. But I confeſs I knew not that any ſuch abſurd Doctrine was in his Books, till of late that I made a more narrow ſearch, occaſioned by his defending the ſame Errors in his *Penſilvanian* Brethren.

Again; In the ſame Anſwer to *T. Danſon's Synopſis*, *T. D* having affirmed that there is a continual need of Faith and Repentance in this life, *G. Whithead* anſwereth, That there is a continual need of Repentance, this I deny; for true Repentance, where it is wrought, and the fruits of it brought forth, this is unto Salvation never to be repented of, and is attended with a real forſaking of ſin and tranſgreſſion.

Annot. G. Whithead's Ignorance greatly appeareth in this, that he thinks Repentance and Perfection inconſiſtent; but it is a ſtrange Perfection that deſtroyeth an Evangelical Virtue and a Fruit of the Spirit, ſuch as Repentance is; and what is Repentance? A change of the mind, or a transformation of the mind, as the *Greek* word, Engliſhed Repentance, implieth; or more particularly, true Evangelical Repentance is a great averſion and perfect hatred of the ſoul to all ſin, and a deep humiliation before God, with godly ſorrow and contrition of ſoul for ſins paſt, which is very conſiſtent with, and very becoming the moſt perfect and holy men that ever lived, ſince all have ſinned. It ſeems it is from this great Error that he and many others of his Brethren ſeldom, if ever, pray for Forgiveneſs of ſin, at leaſt for themſelves; for if there be no need of Repentance, it will follow that there is no need of praying for Forgiveneſs: But all ſound Chriſtians of true ſpiritual experience do know, that both Repentance for ſin, and praying for Forgiveneſs of ſin, are well conſiſtent with the greateſt degree of Holineſs attainable in this life: Nor doth the praying for Forgiveneſs imply univerſally the want of it, more than the praying for the Spirit implieth the want of it.

Again; Whereas it was said in the above Narrative, That G. *Whithead* hath allegorized away the Birth, Death, Resurrection, and coming again of Christ without us to Judgment; take these plain Proofs.

1. His allegorizing away his Birth, prophesied of by *Isaiah*, 9 6. *Unto us a Child is born, a Son is given*: This he expoundeth of Christ born within. *He-Goats Horn*, *Page* 51.

2. He allegorizeth away his Resurrection, expressly denying that Christ was bodily seen of *Paul*, and perverting that place in 1 *Cor.* 15 8. to Christ within. *Page* 51.

3. He allegorizeth away his coming without us to Judgment, in these Scriptures, *Matth.* 16. 27, 28 1 *Thes.* 4 15, 16, 17 Light and Life, *Page* 40, 41.

4. Both he and *Richard Hubberthorne* allegorize away his Burial, *Light and Life*, *Page* 52. and *He-Goats Horn*, *Page* 62 perverting that Scripture, *Isa.* 53. *He made his grave with the wicked*; he adulterates the true Translation, and turns it, *in the wicked*, which the *Hebrew* doth not bear: Where see a most absurd account of the Resurrection, turning it wholly to the Resurrection of two Seeds in two Bodies within men.

5. He allegorizeth away the Resurrection of the Saints Bodies, by his perversion of that place of Scripture, ——*Who shall change our vile body, and fashion it like to his glorious body*, Phil. 3. 21. to a change of the Body that the Apostles and Saints witnessed before death; and yet in contradiction to that, in his *Real Quaker a Real Protestant*, *Page* 105. he understands that very place of a change of the vile, or low and humble Body, like unto the glorious Body of Christ, as a thing to come.

Some other of Geo. Whitehead's *Contradictions.*

1. GEO. *Whitehead* in his *Light and Life*, page 69. thinks him a very blind and ignorant man that reckons Bodies Celestial and Terrestrial to be all one in Matter and Substance; and yet the same *G. W.* in malice of the *Independant Agent*, *pag.* 17. (recited and approved by *John Pennington*, *Apostat. expos'd*, p. 16.) owns that Christ's Body now in Heaven is the same in substance he had on earth: So by his own words he hath declared himself to be a blind and ignorant man, and yet Infallible, otherwise by his own word no true Minister.

2. In a late * printed Half sheet, signed by him and seventeen more, he owneth Christ to be both God and Man, and owneth the Humanity of Christ, making it synonimous with Manhood; and yet it is proved in the above Narrative, that he neither owneth him to be God or Man; finding fault with *W. Burnet* for saying that Christ as God had a Father, and had Glory with God before the world began; arguing as the *Socinians* do, that this would imply two Gods; see *Light and Life*, page 47. Again; He finds fault with *T. Danson* for saying that the Man Christ had a Created Soul: *Answer to* T D.'s *Synopsis*, p. 18. And he blames *R. G.* for saying Christ hath a Bodily Existence without us, in Heaven; *Nat. of Christianity*, page 41.

* *Called the Christian Faith.*

3. In his late Answer to the Queries sent to the Yearly Meeting of the people called *Quakers*, at *London*, signed by Dr. *Lancaster*, Chaplain to the Bishop of *London*, he owns the Blood of Christ that was outwardly shed, to be a part of the Sacrifice, even Christ's Blood that was shed without the gates of *Jerusalem*, together with the whole Sacrifice of himself, both of Soul and Body, was a true Propitiation and Atonement for man's Reconciliation and Peace with God, for Remission of sin, through a living Faith, and true Repentance, *&c.* But in his *Light and Life*, he denieth that the outward Blood was that by which we are either sanctified or justified, and calleth it *a Type*, and saith the *shedding of it was a wicked man's act*; from whence he inferreth that we are not justified by the outward Blood, but pleadeth, that the *Offering Passover Blood, by which we are cleansed, is within*, as the New Covenant is, and not without; See in the Narrative above. And this sort of Unchristian Doctrine *G. Whithead* (as many others)

others) did receive neither from the Spirit of Christ within, nor from the Holy Scriptures, but, as it seems, from *G. Fox*, who in a printed Paper of his, having this Title' *To all People in* Christendom, *concerning Perfect Love*, &c. *also concerning Christ's Flesh which was offered*, (which printed Paper I have; it is joined with some other printed Papers under this general Title, *Several Papers given forth for the spreading of Truth*; See *Page* 55, 57, 59.) hath very unsound and unchristian Doctrine concerning Christ's Flesh, that is, the Offering, in which is the belief; by Christ's Flesh meaning not his outward Flesh. Some of his words I shall faithfully recite as followeth, (that to me are very unsound, and I believe in general to all sound in the Faith): —' And Christ 'according to the flesh crucified, the Lamb slain; that flesh of his which is a Mystery, 'when the first *Adam*'s and *Eve*'s flesh was defiled, and so death reigned from *Adam* to '*Moses*, pag 55. ——And *Pag.* 57. So *Adam*'s, *Eve*'s flesh was defiled, but the flesh of 'Christ, the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world, yet his flesh never corrupted, 'which flesh is the offering; for as he was God he did not dye; and this flesh is a My-'stery; and in this *flesh* (Note) is the belief that takes away the sin, that never corrupted, that is the Offering for sin, and the Blood of this flesh cleanseth from sin. '*P.* 58. — Now they that are in the belief of this flesh, and offering, sees over all 'offerings, to the beginning into the Glory which was with the Father before the 'world began; for all *outward* Offerings and Sacrifices was given to man after he fell, 'and the Lamb slain; which Offering is a *Figure* of Christ, the Seed to be brought 'forth and offered up, and he the Top stone over all laid, to end and finish all the '*outward* Offerings, and Types, and Shadows, and in him there is none, *Page* 59. 'So through this Offering is the Reconciliation, through the offering of his flesh, that 'never corrupted, but takes away corruptions, and his Blood cleanseth from Corruptions *the Life real*. And so this pure Flesh, this Offering, is set over all, which never 'corrupted, which must be your meat if you live: Though there is more in all these 'things, which is hard to be uttered, and cannot be uttered *Yet*.

Annot. It seems what *G. Fox* did not so fully utter as to this Mystery, *George Whitehead* had a mind to utter in his Book called *Light and Life*, that may be as a proper Key to these dark Sayings of *George Fox*. If any object to me, as *Th Elwood* hath done in his Book falsly called *Truth defended*, That I have in some of my Books owned Christ's flesh and Blood within; I answer, I confess it; but no otherwise but in the Scripture sense, and by way of Allegory, and in Metaphor; as when the Divine Life inwardly enjoyed in the Saints, is also called by way of Metaphor and Allegory, Bread, Wine, Oyl, Milk, Honey, Marrow, and Fatness: But I no where remember that I ever said or writ; That the Life or Flesh of Christ within men is the Offering, the Atonement for sin. And if any can shew me any such Passage or Saying in any of my Books, I am most willing and ready to disown and retract it, and blame my Rashness in so saying; but I know no such Passage in any of my Books.

4. In a Treatise of Oaths presented to the King and Parliament, 1675. recommended in a Preface to it, and the Reasons given in it, which Preface is signed by *George Whitehead*, and *William Penn*, and Eleven more, and which Preface obligeth *G. Whitehead* to confess that he owned the Contents of that Book at that time, otherwise he might be construed to put a Trick upon the whole Nation, it is expressly said, *Page* 17. *N* 7. 'We look upon it (saith he and they) to be no less than a presumptuous tempting of God, to summon him as a Witness, not only to our terrene but trivial business, 'such as we should doubtless account it an high Indignity always to sollicite an Earthly 'Prince to give his attendance about. What! make God, the Great God of Heaven and 'Earth our Caution in worldly Controversies; as if we would bind him to obtain our 'ends, that is to make too bold with him, and to carry an undue distance in our minds 'towards him that made us; an Irreverence we can by no means away with. But in flat Contradiction to this, there is an Epistle printed to the Friends called Quakers, within these few Weeks, in this present Year, 1696. that comes from the Meering of Sufferings, signed by *Benjamin Bealing*, their Clerk to their Yearly Meeting. In which

Epiſtle they ſay they give the Senſe of Ancient Friends, *George Fox, Edw. Burrough, Francis Hougel, W. Penn*, and divers more, That Friends may uſe ſuch ſolemn words, when called to declare the Truth, even in worldly matters, as, *I do in the Preſence of God declare*, or *calling God to record*, or *God is Witneſs*. But if it be ſaid that *G. Whithead* hath not ſigned that Epiſtle, ſo is not chargeable with that Contradiction; I anſwer, So nor hath any other of the Miniſtry, nor indeed any one but their Hireling Clerk: But it is well known that *G. W.* is a frequent Member of that Meeting of Sufferings, and hath been a main Inſtrument to perſuade his Friends to give theſe Solemn Atteſtations, which he and many others (I ſay not all) judged unlawful, and forbidden by Chriſt, to uſe in caſes of worldly affairs, as *Recovery of juſt Debts*, and the like. Nor will *G. Whithead*'s hiding himſelf by not ſigning to this Epiſtle, and others concerned, but getting their Hireling Clerk to ſign for them (who for his Yearly Salary muſt do their Drudgery-Work; and if fault be found afterwards with what is done, have this hole to creep out at, *They did not ſign it*), be any Excuſe for him or them, to clear them of ſuch palpable Contradiction, or not varying from their former Principle. The only uſe I make of it, is to prove, That *George Whithead* (as well as others of the Ancient Friends of the Miniſtry, have palpably contradicted their former Teſtimony, delivered in Print to King and Parliament, *Anno* 1675. and that in a very weighty matter; and therefore they are not ſuch infallible men as they have made their too credulous Followers think them to be, and have given out themſelves for, charging all others to be no Miniſters of Chriſt, if not infallible, as the above Narrative ſheweth. But let none from this infer, that I blame them who in ſome weighty Caſes, eſpecially in declaring their Fidelity and faithful Subjection to the Government they are under, do uſe ſuch ſolemn Atteſtations, or judge and condemn their liberty in ſo doing. But the Contradiction of *George Whitheæd* and ſome others to what they have formerly aſſerted very publickly, is that which I would have notified, and their great Hypocriſy ſtill to pretend to Infallibility, and as if ſtill they had never varied in their Principle in any thing; and alſo charging *G. K.* with Apoſtacy, becauſe I have declared, That in divers places and paſſages of my former Writings, I have found cauſe to make ſome Correction and Retractation; God having been pleaſed of late years further to enlighten me, yet without any change of my Faith as to any one Article of the Chriſtian Faith, ſo far as I know.

Having done with *G. Whithead* at preſent, I ſhall next bring ſome two or three more unſound and ſcandalous Paſſages for Proofs, out of *William Penn*'s printed Books, to ſhew the unſoundneſs of his Doctrine in relation to Chriſt, his Fleſh and his Bodily Exiſtence without us in Heaven: And then take notice of ſome of his palpaple Contradictions to himſelf, though he would ſtill make his credulous Followers (that are much fewer than ſometime ago they were) believe he is the ſame infallible *W. Penn*.

1. In his Rejoinder to *John Faldo*, page 179, 180. he greatly blames *Sydrach Sympſon*, an Independent Preacher, for excommunicating *Robert Norwood* for his Opinion, which he, to wit, *W. Penn* himſelf, ſaith, *Is not very offenſive*; and he tells us what that Opinion is; 1. *For denying the Locality of Heaven and Hell, that is void of outward place, as looking upon them to have a more Spiritual ſignification*; and that the other was too Carnal, indeed *Mahometan*. 2. That he believed the Soul to have been breathed from God, thereby aſſigning to it more of Divinity than the uſual Opinion doth. —— Now that he ſaith this *Ro. Norwood*'s Opinion is not very offenſive, and ſo not to deſerve Excommunication, it's plain he thinks it not very offenſive, to deny that Chriſt's Body that was raiſed from the dead, is in any Heaven, that is, an outward place, or without us; which yet (as I appeal to all ſincere Chriſtians) is really ſo offenſive, that the denying of that one Truth, is a plain denial of one of the greateſt Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, and ſo makes void the whole, to any that holds ſuch a damnable Opinion. And next, his excuſing the ſaid *Robert Norwood*, for aſſigning to the Soul ſomething more of Divinity than the uſual Opinion doth, is offenſive and ſcandalous

to

to Christian Ears: For though it should be owned, That the Divine Power that made the Soul of man, is in it, and operateth in it more manifestly than in the inferior Creatures; yet the Soul of man is a created Being, and hath nothing of Divinity essential to it; for that were to make it God himself. And whoever shall compare the Excommunication given out against *Rob. Norwood* by *Sydrac Sympson*, with the Excommunication given out against me by *William Penn* and *Geo. Weithead* at their Yearly Meeting, will say, if they be impartial men, *William Penn* has blamed that in another unjustly, which most unjustly he justifies in himself, and in his Tyrannical Brethren of his Party, who for no other cause did excommunicate me, but for not obeying their most unjust and unreasonable demand, which was, To clear the Body of the People called *Quakers*, and their Ministry, from some of the Errors charged upon them in *Pensilvania*; which as I at that very Meeting told them, I could prove some of them were guilty of, and which I have since effectually done. And that *William Penn* thinks it was such a notable *Argumentum ad hominem*, that *Rob. Norwood* used to them who did excommunicate him, *Are none the People of God but your selves?* Have not I the same *Argumentum ad hominem, against them that excommunicated me*; who in their Nameless Bull of Excommunication, given out against me at the Yearly Meeting at *London*, 1695. call themselves *the Church of Christ, from which* (they say) *I have separated my self*? And because I could not obey their most unjust and unreasonable Demand, they pass this Judgment against me, as if they were *the only Church of Christ*; and in their Yearly Epistle this very year 1696. directed to the Quarterly and Monthly Meetings in *England, Wales*, and elsewhere, they call themselves (to wit, those that generally go under the Name *Quakers*, professing Unity with them) God's whole Heritage and People; this agreeth with *Solomon Eccles* Paper, called, *The Quakers Challenge*, p. 2, 3. 1668. The Quakers are in Truth, and none but they. The Tabernacle of God is with you, and his Dwelling Place is among you, and only among you is God known, said *Edw. Burrough* to the Quakers; see his Works, *page* 64.

2. In the same Rejoinder, *page* 310. he hath a Passage that is either perfect Nonsense, or Antichristian Doctrine, or rather indeed both. I shall cite it *verbatim*. '*Seventhly*, 'Because that Flesh of Christ is called a Vail, but he himself is within the Vail, which 'is the Holy of Holiest, whereinto Christ Jesus our High-Priest hath entred, *Heb.* 10. '20, 21. And as he descended into, and past through a suffering-state in his fleshly ap'pearance, and returned into that state of Immortality, and Eternal Life and Glory, 'from whence he humbled himself, which was and is the Holy of Holiest (then ob'scured or hid by his Flesh or Body, the Vail while in the world) so must all know a 'death to their fleshly ways and Religions, yea their knowledge of Christ himself after 'the flesh, or they stick in the Vail, and never enter into the Holy of Holies, nor come 'to know him in any spiritual relation, as their High and Holy Priest, that abides 'therein.

Annot. I shall make no large Commentary on these words, only in short note, 1. His saying Christ has entred into the Holy of Holies within the Vail, and that Vail is his Flesh, and that Holy of Holies is himself; What Nonsense is this? Was not Christ always in himself? 2. His entring in within the Vail of his Flesh is either perfect Nonsense, or it hath this sense, That he hath put off his Body he had on earth, and is separated from it; as one *Robert Young*, a Preacher among the Quakers in *Pensilvania*, at a Meeting affirmed, and brought these very words of *W. Penn*'s to confirm it, That Christ hath entred within the Vail, and Christ's flesh is that Vail; whereas it is plain, and generally understood by all Christians, That the Vail within which Christ is entred, according to *Heb.* 6. 19. is not his flesh; though elsewhere, but in another respect, his flesh is called a Vail, the word Vail having divers significations in Scripture. 3. That he saith, That all must know a death to their knowledge of Christ after the flesh; it is plain from his words, that he hath this unsound sense of it, That they must know a death to the knowledge of Christ after the flesh, as that flesh signifieth the flesh of Christ, as he came in the flesh. But this is a perversion of *Paul*'s

words,

words, as if *Paul* had rejected the knowledge of Christ as he came and suffered in the flesh, as inconsistent with the revelation of Christ in himself; which are so consistent, that as none have the saving knowledge of Christ as he came and suffered in the flesh, without the inward revelation of him in their hearts, so none have that inward revelation of him, sufficient to Eternal Salvation, but who by that inward revelation know and believe that he came and suffered in the flesh, and that he is now in Heaven, in the same Body that suffered, the same, I say, as to Substance, though wonderfully changed in Manner and Condition.

3. *W. P.* in a Book he calleth *Truth exalted, presented to Princes, Priests, and People*, reprinted *Anno* 1671. he giveth a large description of the Quakers Christ, as he calleth him, *pag.* 13, 14. without mentioning in the least his Birth in the flesh, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, as the Son of Man, or the Son of *Abraham* and *David*; and wholly applying that, *Isaiah* 9. 6, 7. *Unto us a child is born*; and *Deut.* 18. 18 *A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise up*, to the Inward Principle of the Light in all men; and thus he describeth the Quakers Christ, *pag.* 14.

'This is the second *Adam*, the quickening Spirit, the Lord from Heaven, the new 'and spiritual man, the Heavenly Bread, the true Vine, the Flesh and Blood that was 'given for the Life of the World, the second Covenant, the Law writ in the Heart 'and Spirit, put in the inward parts, the way in which the fool cannot err, the Truth 'before Deceit was, the Life that's hid in God, eternal in the Heavens, glorified be-'fore the world began, the Power, the Wisdom, the Righteousness of God, the 'Plant of Renown, the Royal Seed that bruiseth the Serpent's head; in short, that 'Grace which hath appeared unto all men, teaching them to deny Ungodliness, *&c.*

Annot. By this it is plain he makes nothing of Christ, but an inward Principle in all men, which yet falsly he calls the second Covenant, the Law written in the heart; for the Law writ in the heart, that is, the second Covenant, is not in any Unbelievers, but only in the hearts of True Believers. Again, in his large description of the Christian Quaker, filling Three Pages of his *Folio* called the *Christian Quaker*, he mentions not one word of Christ, as he was born of the Virgin, suffered death for our sins, rose again, *&c.* as the Object of Faith, Hope, or Love, or Christian Devotion; see his Pages, 125, 126, 127. By which it plainly appears that he, and *G. Whitehead*, and many other Teachers among the Quakers, have no other Notion of Christ, but an Inward Principle; which is manifestly contrary to the Gospel preached by the Holy Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, who preached Christ chiefly without men, as both God and Man, and consequentially his Light, and Grace, and Spirit within men.

I shall now point at some of *W. Penn*'s most gross and palpable Contradictions.

1. His first Contradiction. In the Treatise of Oaths above-mentioned, signed particularly by *William Penn*, he is earnest against all Oaths under the Gospel; and yet in his *Reason against Railing* he useth the greatest Oath that ever was used among the *Jews*, to wit, *As God liveth*, or, *The Lord liveth*; which was the form of their Oath, as is clear from many places of Scripture, but particularly *Jerem* 4. 2. 5. 2. Now let us hear how he himself hath practically used this Oath against *Thomas Hicks*, pag. 180. 'O that these heavy things might not be laid to thy charge, for *so sure as God liveth* great 'will be the Wrath that shall follow, yea, God will visit for these unrighteous dealings; 'and I testify to thee from God's Living Spirit, if thou desist not, and come not to 'deep Repentance, the Lord will make thee an Example of his Fury, and thy head shall 'not go down to the Grave in Peace; and by this shalt thou know that not a Lying or 'Delusive, but a True and Infallible Spirit hath spoken by me.

Annot. These words imply some Prophecy that *W. Penn* thought he had from the Infallible Spirit of God, against *Tho. Hicks*, importing he should be made an Example of his Fury: But they that saw *Tho. Hicks* dye, and knew him living, say, nothing of this was fulfilled, nor did any thing extraordinary, as any Example of Divine Fury happen to *Tho. Hicks* either before he died, or at his death.

2. His

2. His second Contradiction is this; In the Book called *Judas* and the *Jews*, pag 13. owned and signed by *W. Penn*, he thus glosseth on *Matth* 18. 17. *Go tell the Church*, 'That Christ as well gave his Church Power to reject, as to try Spirits, is not hard to 'prove; that Notable Passage, *Go tell the Church*, does it to our hand; for if in case of 'private Offence betwixt Brethren, the Church is made *Absolute Judge*, from whom 'there is no Appeal in this world, how much more in any the least case that concerns 'the Nature, Being, Faith, and Worship of the Church her self?

Annot. This he spoke with respect to the Quakers Church, whose Power he so mightily extols, that she is made Absolure Judge, from whom there is no Appeal in this world. But having to do with the Church of *England*, or any other Church of them called Protestants, we shall see how he makes a contradictory Gloss on the same Text, *Matth.* 18. 17. *Go tell the Church.* In his Address to Protestants, second Edition, *p.* 152. he saith, '*But what then can be the meaning of Christ's words*, Go tell the Church? *Very* '*well. I answer, It's not about Faith, but Injury, that Christ speaks; and the place explains it* '*self*; Moreover, If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his 'fault between thee and him alone; *here is Wrong, not Religion; Injustice, not Faith or* '*Conscience concerned, as some would have it, to maintain their Church-Power.*

Annot. Here you see he makes the Church-Power very low, as by Church he means the Church of *England*, or any other Church besides the Church of the Quakers. But when he means the Church of the Quakers from the same Text, he magnifies her Power as great as ever *Bellarmine* or any other Jesuit magnified the Church of *Rome*. *She* (to wit, the Quakers Church, otherwise tell us what other Church he means) *is made Absolute Judge*, from whom there is no Appeal in this world. Then be sure, if *W. Penn* can prevail to keep up this Authority in the Quakers Church, neither *G Keith*, nor any other against whom that he calleth the Church, to wit, the Yearly Meeting at *London*, hath passed any Sentence, however unjust, must expect to have any Relief or Redress in this world. Well, It is a great Comfort that we may expect it in the world to come. If this be not to play the Ambidexter (a Crime *T. Elwood* unjustly casteth on me in another case) I know not what is.

3. His Third Contradiction is this. In his *Address to Protestants*, second Edition, *pag.* 246. he saith, 'Men that are angry for God, passionate for Christ, that can call 'Names for Religion, and fling Stones for Faith, may tell us they are Christians if 'they will, but no body would know them to be such by their fruits; to be sure they 'are no Christians of Christ's making.

Annot. One would think this man would be far from giving hard Names to any that differ from him in Religious Matters, and that he would be one of the civilest men on earth, for softly and gently treating his Opponents. But instead thereof, I know not if ever I read or heard more angry and passionate words, and more undecent and unbecoming any man, either Christian or sober Heathen, than *William Penn* hath given to his Opponents, and such as he hath differed from in Religious Matters; witness what he saith in his *Guide mistaken*, p. 18. 1668 *The old Gormandizing Priests of* England.—*No sort of people have been so universally through Ages the Bane of Soul and Body of the Universe, as that abominable Tribe, for whom the Theatre of God's most dreadful Vengeance is reserved to act their eternal Tragedy upon* Again; in his *Quakerism a new Nickname*, &c. p. 165. he saith, 'But in the earth there is not any thing so phantastical, conceited, proud, 'railing, busy-body, and sometimes ignorant, as a sort of Priests, to us not unknown, 'among whom our Adversary (*viz. John Faldo*, an Independent Preacher) is not 'the least, who think their Coat will bear out their worst Expressions for Religion; 'and practise an haughty Reviling for Christ, as one of the greatest demonstrations 'of their Zeal; an Ill bred and Pedantick Crew, the Bane of Reason, and Pest of the 'World, the old Incendiaries to mischief, and the best to be spared of Mankind; 'against whom the boiling Vengeance of an irritated God is ready to be poured out, 'to the destruction of such if they repent not, and turn from their abominable De-'ceits.

Annot.

Annot. Seeing the only Reason that was given at the Meeting at *Turner's Hall* the 11th of this Instant, 1696. by one of *William Penn*'s Party, why they excommunicated *George Keith*, having nothing either against his Doctrine or Conversation among men, but that he was (as he was pleased to call me) a little petulant, and turbulent Man; and that they have aggravated some few words I gave to some professed Infidels among us in *Pensilvania*, to that height, as deserving Excommunication: Let the Impartial Reader judge, whether *W. Penn* has not far exceeded me, and that incomparably, (for I thank God I have not the faculty to invent such words) as well as *George Whithead* hath also done, in calling some that but differed from him about Womens Meetings, and Church Orders of *G. Fox* Incarnate Devils, Wolves, Dogs, in his Preface to *Judgment Fixed*, 1682. Behold therefore their Injustice and Partiality, for when did they ever so much as censure either of them for such scurrilous, abusive Language, or any others that have used the like? Nay, of all people on the face of the Earth, many of the Preachers and Writers among the Quakers, that I know of, have been most guilty in this thing, and doubled this guiltiness in fathering these sinful Words, and their sinful Passion on the Spirit of God, as *W. Penn* did, when he called me Apostate, and Impostor, for defending Christian Doctrine common to all Christendom, saying, He was transported by the Glorious Power of God. For my own part, wherein I have at any time either in word or Writ exceeded in giving any uncharitable Names to any, or in any uncharitable practise or behaviour, I declare I am sorry for it, and have begged, and do beg God's forgiveness for it, for his dear Son's sake, and also the forgiveness of any whom I have at any time justly offended in words or behaviour; and I bless God, who has taught me more patience by the late Exercises I have gone through of the strife of Tongues; and I hope I can in measure say, that I witness that place of Scripture fulfilled, *That tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience*; and this I have divers times acknowledged to my late Adversaries, who have made ill use of it against me, but I never knew they made any such acknowledgment to any, I am sure never to me, whom they have most unworthily abused both by Word and Pen.

And now before I have quite done with *William Penn*, let me put him in mind of his Promise, That he would answer me in the face of the Nation; for I think I have made good my word, that I have put him to prove his Charge against me (that I am an Apostate) in the face of the Nation; and let him not put off this Work that belongs to himself, to any Deputy, or busy Intruder, as *Th. Elwood*, or *John Pennington*, who have already sufficiently shewn their folly in print; but let him perform his Promise by himself, and also remind his words in his Christian Quaker, *pag.* 1. who saith, *I was not willing that any should answer for my faults, if any there were; and if innocent, I esteemed my self both sufficient and obliged to my own relief.*

Some of Tho. Elwood *his Vile and Gross Errors; truly collected out of his Book, falsly called,* Truth Defended.

I Shall pass by at present his many Forgeries, and Perversions, and Abuses against me in this his last Book, and his two former Books; to the first of which I have answered in print, having collected out of his two last Abusive Books above an hundred manifest Perversions, Forgeries, and Falsities he hath heaped up against me, which I have in readiness to shew, and which I keep by me for a reserve, until I find an occasion to publish them, either by print, or otherwise; therefore I shall only now make an Index of some of his Vile and Gross Errors contained in his last Book, called *Truth Defended.*

1. The Blood that came out of Christ's Side, its shedding, was not done to compleat the Offering, because, before that, Christ said, *Consummatum est, it is finished,*

p. 99. Note, this is as much againſt his Death, for before his Death he ſaid, *it is finiſhed.*

2. He juſtifies *George Whitehead*'s Doctrine and Words, denying that the material Blood of the Beaſts were Types of Chriſt's material Blood, and yet fallaciouſly ſeems to own it, *p.* 106.

3. He juſtifies *W. Penn*'s Doctrine; ſaying, The one Seed cannot be an outward thing; for one outward thing cannot be the proper ſign of another outward thing; *p.* 113.

4. He denieth that the gift of the Divine Grace or Power within, is the real Purchaſe of Chriſt's Obedience unto death; arguing, That if ſo, that would not be the free Gift of God, *p.* 121. This is contrary to *Rom.* 5. 15. *Eph.* 1. 14. and 4. 7, 8 compared with *Pſal.* 68. 18.

5. He blames me for ſaying Chriſt's Body is the ſame in ſubſtance it was on Earth, *p.* 129. now if not the ſame in ſubſtance, then that Body he had on Earth is not in being, or he muſt hold the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation in that caſe.

6. He denieth that Chriſt came by Generation of, and from the Properties of Man in *Mary*, p. 136. and in ſo doing, he muſt deny him to be the Son of *David* and *Abraham*.

7. He perverteth the Apoſtle's Creed, in that Clauſe, *Conceived of the Holy Ghoſt*, *p.* 138. by which he infers, that Chriſt came not by Generation of, and from the Properties of Man in *Mary*; and in ſo doing, he makes the Holy Ghoſt to be the material Cauſe of that Generation; as if that Holy Thing conceived, were of the Subſtance of the Holy Ghoſt; whereas the Holy Ghoſt was the efficient Cauſe thereof, but not the material Cauſe.

8. His falſe way of reaſoning againſt the Man Chriſt's being created, from my reaſoning, if not created, therefore not Man; by retorting, if created, therefore not God; and in this he chargeth me to be deeply drenched into *Socinianiſm*, but this is his ignorance. This is as fooliſh as to argue, *A. B.* is no *Engliſh* Man, therefore is no Man; whereas it is good arguing, *A. B.* is no Man, therefore no *Engliſh* Man; the *Socinian* Error is not, that Chriſt is a Creature, but that he is a meer Creature, *viz.* only Man, and not both God and Man, *p.* 139.

9. His blaming me, to make light of the work of Generation in compariſon of Chriſt's Incarnation; therefore according to him, Regeneration is greater than Chriſt's Incarnation. Oh great Blaſphemy! *pag.* 155.

10. His ſaying, That the Author of Regeneration is Chriſt *chiefly*, as he is manifeſted inwardly in the heart, *p.* 152. This is as abſurd, as to ſay, The Beams of the Sun that deſcend on the Earth, are the chief cauſe of the Earth's fruitfulneſs, and not the Sun it ſelf that is in the Firmament.

My anſwer to *John Pennington*'s Book, falſly called, *An Apoſtate Expoſed*: In his ſaid Book he brings no matter againſt me, either as to Doctrine or Life; but ſets down ſome Citations out of my Books, and the Doctrine in all theſe Citations I own. But that I thought it had been the Doctrine of the *Quakers* in general, and of *George Whithead* and *William Penn* in particular; in that I own my miſtake; but this is no contradiction, or proof of my Apoſtacy; for I did not poſitively ſay, they had no Errors, but according to the beſt of my knowledge they had no Errors; this is no contradiction; for Contradictions (according to that true Maxim) are *ſecundum idem, ad idem eodem loco, tempore & ratione*. But he hath not ſo much either Logick or common Senſe to underſtand, that this is no contradiction, or what a true Contradiction is, as neither his *quondam* Tutor *Tho. Elwood* hath.

As concerning *Caleb Puſey* his Book, falſly called, *His Modeſt Account*; I have a full Anſwer to it in readineſs, but there is no preſent need of its publication. But let it be noticed, that my Adverſaries have owned it, as having unity with it; and no doubt it was approved by the 2d Days meeting.

I only at present note these few gross things in it.

First, He misstates the Question, which was not, That the Light within is sufficient for Salvation, without something else; for the Light within, or Grace within *Paul* and *Peter*, &c. is sufficient to Salvation, without thousands of some things else, as without thousands of *Caleb Pusey*, and all of us; but not without the Man Christ without us. But the true state of the Question was, and is, That whereas they blamed my Assertion, *viz. The Light within is not sufficient to Salvation, without something else.* They are obliged to hold the Contradictory, which is, The Light within is sufficient to Salvation, without any, or every thing else; true Contradictions being betwixt the one Particular, the other Universal; but it hath been my Lot to have to do generally with such Ignorant Men of late in dispute, that know not either by the Logick or common Sense, what a true Contradiction is.

2. *Page* 8. His false quotation of my words, citing my Book called, *A Refutation*, *pag.* 38, 39. where he brings me in saying, It is a real degree of Blasphemy to say, *This Light* cannot make Satisfaction, *&c.* But I use no such words, therefore this is a gross Forgery, which I charge upon the Second day's Meeting; for in all that Treatise I neither said nor intended any thing of the *Light within*, making Satisfaction; for the Question there treated of by me, was not about Satisfaction, but Revelation, what the *Light within* could reveal. And I was so far from affirming the *Light within*, as we give Obedience to it, to make any Satisfaction for our sins, that I plainly said, *pag.* 41. *ad finem*, That man's most exact Obedience to the Light in him, cannot be an Atonement or Propitiation unto God for sins past or present.

3. His Fallacy or Forgery, *pag.* 12. in feigning a Contradiction on me, concerning the express Knowledge of Christ, necessary, and not necessary; whereas I never said it was universally necessary, but only to such who have the occasion to hear it preach'd; therefore I distinguished betwixt the Express and Implicit, saying this last was universally necessary, the former only to Particulars.

4. *Pag.* 15. His most gross Assertion, which is justly charged on the Second day's Meeting (who have approved his Antichristian Book), That subely *Jesus of Nazareth* cannot be something else than the Light, Spirit, and Power within. For at this rate the *Jews* who own and confess to the Light within, and *Pagan* Philosophers who blasphemed against the Man *Jesus of Nazareth*, yet confessing to the Light within, may be said to confess *Jesus of Nazareth*; and if *Jesus of Nazareth* be not something else than the Light within, then it is in vain to preach any Christ without, that was born at *Bethlehem*, and conversed at *Nazareth*. But he is guilty of gross Forgery, to infer it from my words: He says, *pag.* 14. The World only is alone, and admits of nothing else; but I answer, It admits not of another Christ, but it admits of something of Christ *without* us, that is not *within* us; as Christ that died for us is the only Saviour; this only admits not of another Saviour, or Christ, *within* us, yet it admits of something of Christ within us, that was not outwardly crucified, *viz.* His Grace and Spirit.

As concerning the pretended Confession of Faith, called, *Our Ancient Testimony renewed*, of our Adversaries from *Pensilvania*, subscribed by *Caleb Pusey*, and above Thirty six more, though the Scripture-Words as therein recited, we own, yet seeing they (and particularly he) who have differed from us in *Pensilvania*, have declared a contrary sense to all these Places of Scripture touching the things in Controversy betwixt us, and have neither in that Confession, nor elsewhere, renounced their former Errors, whereof they have been proved guilty, their Confession is but a mere Sham, and Mock-Confession.

G. K.

ERRATA. *Page* 17. *line* 7. *for* Days *read* Words. *Page* 48. *line* 44. *read* their me.

A Sermon preached at the Meeting of Proteſtant Diſſenters, called Quakers, in *Turners*-Hall, *London*; on the *16th.* of the Second Month, 1696. Being the Publick Day of Thankſgiving for the Deliverance of the King and Kingdom. By *George Keith.* To which is added, A Teſtimony of Fidelity and Subjection to King *William* the Third, from the aforeſaid People, on behalf of themſelves, and others of the ſame Perſuaſion with them.

Printed for B. Aylmer *at the* Three Pigeons *in* Cornhill.

THE General Hiſtory of the Quakers; containing the Lives, Tenents, Sufferings, Tryals, Speeches, Letters, and Travels, of all the moſt Eminent Quakers, both Men and Women, from the firſt Riſe of that Sect, down to this preſent time. Collected from Manuſcripts, *&c.* A Work never attempted before in *Engliſh*; being written originally in *Latin* by *Gerard Croeſe*, and now made publick againſt their preſent Yearly Meeting in *London.* To which is added, *Fox*'s Conference with *Oliver Cromwell.* The Tryals and dying Speeches of the Quakers executed in *New-England.* An Account of their Marriages and Burials. A Quaker's Letter to King *Charles* II. charging him with ſeveral vile Practices. *Keith*'s Learned Speech at his Tryal in *Penſilvania.* The Tryals of *Mead* and *Pen.* *Pen*'s Speech to the Judges. His Conference with the Princeſs *Palatine.* His Sermon before Her. The Princeſs's Letter to *Geo. Fox.* *Margaret Fox*'s Letter to a General Meeting of Women, held at *London* in the year 1692. A very particular Account of the Women Preachers. *Heſter Bidly*'s Speech to the late Queen *Mary.* Her Entertainment at *Verſailles* by King *James.* Her Letter to the *French* King. Her Diſcourſes with him. The great Sufferings of two Quaker Women in the Iſland *Malta.* The Rarity of *Mary Fiſher*'s Voyage to *Adrianople.* The Audience given this Maiden Quaker by the *Grand Signior.* The Preſent State of the Quakers. As alſo a Letter writ by *George Keith*, and ſent by him to the Reverend Author of this Book; containing a Vindication of himſelf, and ſeveral Remarks upon this curious Hiſtory. *Price Bound* 5 *s.*

Printed for John Dunton *at the* Raven *in* Jewen-Street.